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# THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT OF 1971 

By Rear Adm. A. C. WAGNER, USCG<br>Chief, Office of Boating Safety

I can say with certainty that the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 has gone a long way toward making recreational boating a safer activity. After four years of cooperation and negotiation between the U.S. Coast Guard, the states, the boating industry, the volunteer safety organizations, and the boating public, the Act was passed by Congress and gave us a solid statement of national policy with which to work in improving the safe use of watercraft while fostering greater development and enjoyment of our Nation's waters.

Learning to live with the new law, which changed traditional attitudes and responsibilities has been a bit difficult. We felt that we knew the proposed law pretty well, but we are only now beginning to understand how it all fits together.

Most people in the merchant marine industry are familiar with the older Coast Guard programs in boating safety. With the advent of the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, however, the U.S. Coast Guard has embarked on some significant new directions.

Since 1940, we have been involved in implementing operator requirements. Where the new program differs from these former efforts is that the Coast Guard now has the authority
to develop and implement minimum standards governing the construction and performance of boats; and this places many more responsibilities on the manufacturer.

Regulations published last summer in the Federal Register outline those responsibilities. They include minimum standards for manufacturers in the areas of loading, safe powering, and emergency flotation of boats. In addition, manufacturers are required to mark capacity information on each craft, they must certify that their products comply with all applicable standards on the date of manufacture, and they must now participate in a hull identification numbering system that became effective November 1st of last year, to more readily keep track of each boat built. It is noteworthy, at this juncture, to reiterate that it is the responsibility of the manufacturer, not the Coast Cuard or an independent testing agency, to certify that each boat is in compliance with standards. This is a departure from the procedure followed in the case of construction of merchant vessels, where the Coast Guard certifies compliance with applicable rules and regulations. Furthermore, under the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, it is the manufacturer's sole responsibility to repair or correct at his cost and expense, any
manufacture-related defect which creates a substantial risk of injury to the public, or any failure on his part to comply with a Coast Guard standard.

So you can see the significant difference of the Federal Boat Safety Act in maritime legislation. The intent of the law requires that we, the Coast Guard, move with deliberation in making and implementing standards and regulations. Each standard must be based on need; it must be reasonable; and, in developing the standard, we must consider available standards and statistics and data (including private research, development, testing and evaluation). We must consult with a citizen Boating Safety Advisory Council, and we must follow the procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act, including granting a substantial period for public comment. And each regulatory proposal is carefully scrutinized by the Marine Safety Council before it is promulgated by the Commandant. All of this takes time; but, it is time well spent. It is a safeguard to the public and the industry against hasty regulation, and it is a safeguard to us in that it insures that our work receives an adequate review.

The next few years will continue to bring further changes in our tradi-
tional approach to the salety problems in recreational boating. Before the new law was enacted, we lived for over 30 years with the one basic law affecting boats and equipment: the old Motorboat Act of 1940 . However, the Motorboat Act of 1940 made no provisions for a broad regulatory authority to meet a range of safety problems. I suppose this had one advantage (if you could call it that): the
situation was kept static. Traditional approaches to safety problems had been established and it was relatively easy for the industry and the Coast Guard to know exactly what was to be done. Any changes to these provisions required an Act of Congress to amend the original Act.
Now, with the broad new regulatory authority of the 1971 Act, things are different, and will continue to be

## ADMIRAL WAGNER LEAVES OFFICE OF BOATING SAFETY

This month represents the completion of Rear Admiral A. C. Wagner's tour as Chief of the Office of Boating Safety. Admiral Wagner will become the Commander of the Coast Guard's Seventh District, headquartered in Miami, Florida.

Taking command of the Office of Boating Safety, in August, will be Rear Admiral J. F. Thompson, Jr., who is currently serving as the Superintendent of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut.

Also leaving the Office of Boating Safety is the Deputy Office Chief, Captain J. W. Hume. Captain Hume is retiring this month, after thirty-two years service in the Coast Guard.

Replacing Captain Hume is Captain J. H. Durfee, Chief of the Coast Guard's Office of Public and International Affairs. During the interim period, prior to Admiral Thompson's arrival, Captain Durfee will be the Acting Chief of the Office of Boating Safety.
so. The safety situation is no longer static; things are moving, and one of our biggest problems is to get the word on the new developments to all who need to know: the manufacturers, the enforcement personnel, and of course, the boating public.

In this issue of the Proceedings, then, we will be telling you about our role in enforcing the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, our responsibilities under that law, and our achievements. Mind you, it's not merely a matter of "tooting our own horn" (though we are justifiably proud of our efforts). Rather, we are trying to follow the advice of communication theorists who believe that to make the general public aware of some particular information, the first step is to reach the opinion makers. And, in the realm of the sea, who is more qualified to act as an opinion maker than the professional mariner? Therefore, we hope that your familiarity with our efforts to make boating safer might be passed on to the much more numerous, non-professional, recreational boating public. And who is to benefit by an increased awareness of our boating safety efforts? Well, we know it must initially be everyone who uses the sea, be he recreational or commercial.

This is a whole new concept! So far it has worked beautifully. We want you to understand it. Read on, and learn what it is all about.


Dewatering devices, and distress signals are the subjects of regulations currently under consideration by the U.S. Coast Guard, for use on recreational boats.

# BOATING ACCIDENTS SHOW VALUE OF PFD'S 

The circumstances surrounding recreational boating accidents are rarely identical in any two incidents. It follows, then, that there is no such thing as the "typical" accident.

However, one aspect of many accidents might be called "typical". That is, many fatalities were needless and could have been prevented had the victim been wearing a personal flotation device (PFD). Coast Guard statistics reveal that in over $57 \%$ of the 1,318 drownings (the largest single cause of fatalities resulting from boating accidents), a PFD was available but not worn.
Following are some accident narratives. None is "typical"; but each has one thing in common: a PFD can be a lifesaver. The names used in the first two narratives are fictitious.

## Boatman Dies After Saving Companions

The certificate shows that the cause of death was "drowning". The Coast Guard investigation concluded that "Had the victim been wearing a lifesaving device he probably would not have drowned." These are the circumstances:
To enjoy a pleasant summer evening, Mr. Hotel planned a family outing to view a local fireworks display. From their vantage point aboard a 22 -foot inboard boat, cruising just off of the Lake Michigan shore, Hotel and his family had a panoramic view of the festivities. Joining Hotel, his wife and their two children (aged 5 and 9), were Mr. Sierra, Mrs. Kilo, and her four-year old son.

It was a clear evening, though the air was slightly chilly and the waters
of Lake Michigan were choppy as a result of 7 to 14 mile-per-hour winds.

When the fireworks display was over, Hotel turned the boat around and headed back to the mooring. While he was on deck manning the controls, his family and friends were huddled in the forward cabin. Suddenly a jarring was felt, and in the darkness, the group realized that they had hit the breakwater, about 200 yards north of the entrance to the river where the boat was to be moored. Hotel jumped to the breakwater and attempted to push the boat away from the wall; he tried in vain. Hotel, noticing that the craft was rapidly flooding, jumped back into the boat and assisted his passengers onto the breakwater. As the boat was sinking beneath them, Hotel handed the children one at a time to Sierra on the wall. When the last child was safe, Mr. Sierra turned back to help Hntel, but, Hotel had disappeared from view.

Some time later that evening, the Coast Guard recovered the body of Hotel, and a police ambulance took the boatman to the County Hospital, where he was pronounced dead on arrival.

Mr. Hotel was reported to have been a good swimmer, but in saving the lives of his companions he disregarded his own safety. Would he be alive today, had he worn a PFD?

Probably.

## PFD Saves One As Three Others Drown

Fishing is reputed to be excellent in those areas just below the spillway (s) of dams. It was that attraction which,
brought John, Enoch, Ricky, and Mary Jane Bravo; to the area just below the George Andrews Darn on the Chattahoochee River, near Columbia, Alabama. The four were aboard their fourteen-foot outboard, anchored in an area posted with "Danger" and "Keep Out" warnings.

It was growing dark that warm, calm, clear June evening when tragedy struck. At about 8:30 PM, the flood gates of the dam were opened, and the waters where the four had been fishing became rough and turbulent. They tried to make a quick departure from the danger zone, but when John tried to start the engine, there was no response. He went aft to examine the problem, but in so doing, there was too much weight in the stern, and the swirling waters rushed into the boat. In no time at all, the swamped boat capsized, and all occupants were thrown adrift. Of the four persons, only Mary Jane was wearing a PFD. While the others were struggling to survive in the turbulent waters, she was able to remain afloat, and eventually made her way to the river bank.
The Coast Guard investigating officers attributed the tragic events to negligence on the part of the operator, in that he entered an area known to be (and clearly marked) dangerous. The investigators also concluded that, "Had Johnny, Enoch, and Ricky been wearing Coast Guard approved vest type life preservers, their lives might have been saved."

If one point can be stressed, based on the above, true narratives, it is that personal flotation devices can save lives: but they have to be worn.



#### Abstract
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[^1]ON MARCH 28, 1973 , the U.S. Coast Guard published final regulations that classify Personal Flotation Devices (PFDs) into five categories, and
specify which type of device is required on which class of recreational boat.
The accompanying chart illustrates the salient provisions of the new regulations, which become effective on October 1 , 1973 . Prior to that date,
the present or the new regulations. "pFD "tpes" whereas the regulations specify five "lypes." The type V PFD is a special purpose device. At this time there is no special purpose device approved for use on recteational boats.

# THE BOATING STANDARDS PROGRAM AND THE FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT OF 1971 

## Introduction

The Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, enacted August 10, 1971, grants to the Coast Guard the authority to promulgate regulations establishing minimum safety standards for boats and associated equipment, and establishing procedures and tests required to measure conformance with such standards. As used here the word "boat" is any vessel manufactured or used primarily for non-commercial use. The specific applicability of the Law is given in detail. It applies to vessels and associated equipment used, to be used or carried in vessels used on waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and on the high seas beyond the territorial waters for vessels owned in the United States. The Act applies, for standards purposes, to boats moved or intending to be moved in interstate commerce. Thus, the applicability of the law extends to almost every recreational boat built, with the exception of those few boats built locally in a State for use on waters solely under the jurisdition of that State. Unlike the old Motorboat Act of 1940 there is no size limitation for the boats to which the Law applies.

The Act further authorizes regulations requiring the installation, carrying or using of associated equipment on boats and classes of boats subject to the Act and prohibiting the installation, carrying or using of associated equipment which does not conform with safety standards established under the Act's provisions. This general regulatory authority allows the Coast Guard to meet the safety standards problem head on.

Each standard promulgated must be reasonable, meet a need for boating safety, and be stated insofar as.practicable in terms of performance.

The law's provisions are clear as to the steps the Coast Guard must take in formulating and prescribing regulations and standards. It must-

1. Consider the need for regulations and the extent to which the regulations or standards will contribute to boating safety;
2. Consider relevant available boat safety standards, statistics and data (including public and private research and development), testing and evaluation;
3. Consider whether any proposed regulation or standard is reasonable and appropriate for the particular type boat or associated equipment for which it is prescribed and;
4. Consult with the Boating Safety Advisory Council, established pursuant to Section 33 of the Act, regarding all of the foregoing considerations.

The first three requirements are met almost as a matter of course in the development of any safety standard. The fourth is unique to the Federal Boat Safety Act. The Boating Safety Advisory Council is constituted of 21 individuals with expert knowledge of boating and boating safety problems. Its function is advisory, and its advice plays a vital role in the development of reasonable and effective safety standards.

Reports of need for a specific safety standard come to the Coast Guard from many sources. Boat accident statistics are a major source of this information. An engineering analysis may detect hazard before accident statistics reflect it. Reports of need may come from Coast Guard field forces, from the States, from the boating public, and from the manufacturers who build the boats and associated equipment. They are evaluated very carefully. Available boat safety standards from industry and public voluntary programs, from the States and from other nations are compiled and researched together with private research, development, testing and evaluation. From this work comes the first element in standards development, the "justification of need" package.

The justification of need is discussed with the Boating Safety Advisory Council, after which a standards project may be established.
The establishment of a specific standards project is the meat of regulation and standards development. During this phase the Coast Guard works very closely with the public, the States, interested organizations, and the indus-
try to assure that standards development is done with the best advice available.

When proposed regulations and standards are completed they are again reviewed with the Boating Safety Advisory Council, considering especially whether they are reasonable and appropriate for the particular type of boat or associated equipment concerned. Finally, after internal Coast Guard clearance through the Marine Safety Council, they are published in the Federal Register as "Notices of Proposed Rulemaking". Each Notice of Proposed Rulemaking must provide time for the public to offer comments, and each comment must be thoroughly evaluated. In most cases, informal public hearings are held at which those persons or organizations wishing to offer oral comments are given the opportunity to speak. It is only after all these comments are considered that the final rule is prepared and published.

The Federal Boat Safety Act specifies that the effective date of a new rule shall not be sooner than 180 days from the date of its issuance. This delay in effective date may be extended to not more than 18 months in cases involving major product design, retooling, or major changes in the manufacturing process. It may be shortened if there exists a boating safety hazard so critical as to require an earlier effective date.

Thus, the standards development process involves substantial public input and thorough review by the Boating Safety Advisory Council. The time taken by this procedure is devoted to careful consideration of a regulation or standard which will have mandatory application.

## Standards Compliance

Safety standards, no matter how well thought out or how potentially effective, are only abstract until they are applied to boats and associated equipment. The Federal Boat Safety Act assigns the responsibility for standards compliance. Section 12 of the Act states, in effect, that no person shall manufacture, construct, assemble, introduce, or deliver for introduction into interstate commerce or import into the United States, or if engaged in the business of selling or distributing boats or associated equipment, sell or offer for sale any boat, associated equipment, or component thereof to be sold for subsequent assembly unless it conforms with regulations and standards prescribed under the Act's authority.

There are about 1,899 companies in the United States which build recreational boats. There are well over 20,000 dealers and distributors and innumerable manufacturers of associated equipment. Over 400,000 boats are built each year and assuring standards compliance for all of these is a tremendous task.

The approach chosen by the Coast Guard for the Boating Standards Program is to leave primary responsibility for compliance directly where it is placed by the Act-at the manufacturer's level. The manufacturer is required to
certify to his customer that each boat and associated equipment item to which standards apply complies with the applicable requirements. This is done on a certification plate or statement on or accompanying the item concerned. This approach leaves quality and production control to the manufacturer, since he himself must certify each individual item. This certification program is the heart of the Coast Guard's compliance system.

The certification system is backed up by a "spot check" system in which the Coast Guard purchases boats and associated equipment items on the open market and tests them by the standards to which the manufacturer has certified. This system is based on accident analysis, reports of deficiencies in boats and equipment, and a statistically valid sample of the general production population.

Under the certification system, the builder will have no Coast Guard Certificate of Inspection certifying that his product does comply with the standards. The Federal Boat Safety Act gives him some protection in that he shall not be subject to any penalty if he establishes that he clid not have reason to know, in the exercise of due care, that a boat or associated equipment item does not conform with applicable Federal standards. But with wide publication of the standards and the periodic issuance of Boating Safety Circulars containing standards information, which are sent to all known manufacturers, there appear to be very few cases where a manufacturer should not have known of the safety standerds. The Coast Guard both at Headquarters and at the District Office level is willing and indeed anxious to discuss the manufacturers problems with him and to do all that it possibly can to help him undertake his responsibilities under the Federal Boat Safety Act.

## Notification of Defects: Repair or Replacement

The manufacturer's responsibility for the safety of his product does not end with compliance with published standards. If his boat or associated equipment item contains a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public he will be faced with the requirement of defect notification. In some ways this is similar to the defect notification program for automobiles.

The manufacturer has the burden to undertake notification without prompting from the Coast Guard. This portion of the Act does not apply to the many millions of boats now on the waters to which standards promulgated under the Act's authority do no apply, nor does it generally apply.to associated equipment items. For the purposes of defect notification "associated equipment" includes only such items or classes of equipment as shall be prescribed by regulation or order. The equipment items so designated are outboard engines, inboard engines and stern drive units.

The nntification, when required, must be given by certified mail to the first purchaser for purposes other than
resale, provided however that the requirement for notification of the first purchaser shall be satisfied if the manufacturer exercises reasonable diligence in creating and maintaining a list of such purchasers and their current addresses and sends the required notice to each person on the list at the address appearing thereon. He must also provide notification to subsequent purchasers if he knows of them and to dealers and distributors of the manufacturer to whom the boat or associated equipment was delivered.

The notification must contain a clear description of the defect or failure to comply, an evaluation of the hazard reasonably related thereto and a statement of the measures to be taken to correct the defect or failure to comply. The Federal Boat Safety Act requires an undertaking by the manufacturer to take the corrective measures at his sole cost and expense. Thus, the public has the right, under law, to be informed if the boat or designated equipment item which it purchases has a substantial safety defect or fails to comply with applicable mandatory safety standards and the manufacturer has the responsibility for correcting the defect or failure to comply.

The manufacturer has the additional responsibility of furnishing the Coast Guard copies of all notices, bulletins and other communications to dealers or distributors or to purchasers regarding any defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public or any failure to comply with a standard regulation or order applicable to the boat or associated equipment.

But what of the boats and equipment items to which standards do not yet apply? If through testing, inspection, investigation, research or examination of reports carried out pursuant to the Federal Boat Safety Act it is determined that any boat or associated equipment subject to this Act fails to comply with applicable standards or regulations or contains a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public and if it is further determined that the notification provided under the Federal Boat Safety Act authority is appropriate, the Coast Guard must notify the manufacturer of the defect or failure to comply. On receipt of the notice, which will also include a synopsis of this information upon which the findings are based, the manufacturer must furnish the notification unless he disputes the determination. In that case he must be afforded an opportunity to present his views to establish that there is no failure of compliance or defect creating a substantial risk of personal injury to the public. If, after the presentation by the manufacturer, it is still determined that the boat or associated equipment does not comply with applicable standards or regulations or contains a safety defect the Coast Guard may direct the manufacturer to furnish the notification. This, of course, includes the burden to repair or replace the defective items. These provisions of the Federal Boat Safety Act have caused perhaps the most discussion of any of the Act's provisions since its passage.

The Coast Guard is working on a number of potentially serious defect cases. In no case, thus far, has it been necessary to call forth the full authority of the law. Manufacturers of boats and associated equipment have proven anxious to stand behind their products and have taken voluntary action to correct safety defects.

It is well to note here again that the provisions of the law apply to defects which create a substantial risk of personal injury to the public. Since the passage of the Federal Boat Safety Act there has been an increase in the number of letters to the Coast Guard from boat owners which point out defects in the boats or equipment items. While some of these do concern potentially serious safety defects others concern cosmetic or minor defects outside the scope of the Federal Boat Safety Act. All of these letters are brought to the attention of the manufacturer concerned and in most cases, the problems are settled to the mutual satisfaction of the boat owner and the manufacturer.

The "notification of defects; repair or replacement" provisions of the Federal Boat Safety Act place heavy responsibilities on the manufacturer for the safety of his product. Consistent, effective administration of these provisions requires close cooperation between the U.S. Coast Guard and the manufacturing community.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the Coast Guard now has the authority to mount an effective program for assuring that boats and associated equipment meet reasonable safety standards and are free from serious safety defects. As individual States and political subdivisions have become involved to a greater or lesser extent with safety standards and for carrying safety equipment, both the boatman and the manufacturer have been faced with varying requirements. The Federal Boat Safety Act establishes Federal preemption to correct this situation. The entire thrust of the Federal preemption provision is to assure uniformity of boat and associated equipment safety standards and carriage requirements for safety equipment to allow free and unimpeded movement and use of boats among all the States.

The foregoing summary of the Act's provisions and the Coast Guard's approach to implementation has concerned those portions of the Federal Boat Safety Act upon which the boating standards program is based. Some of the other major provisions of the Act can be discussed here in a very short form to indicate its total scope.

Portions of the Act apply to the boatman:

1. No person may use a vessel in violation of the Act or regulation issued thereunder.
2. No person may use a vessel in a negligent manner so as to endanger the life, limb, or property of any other person.
3. If a Coast Guard boarding officer observes a boat being used without sufficient lifesaving or firefighting devices or in an overloaded or other unsafe condition as defined in regulations and in the judgement of that boarding officer such use creates an especially hazardous condi-
tion, he may direct the operator of the boat to take whatever immediate and reasonable steps would be necessary for the safety of those aboard the vessel. These steps may include directing the operator to return to mooring, and to remain there until the situation creating the hazard is corrected.
4. The operator of a vessel involved in a collision, accident or other casualty, to the extent he can do so without serious danger to his own vessel or persons aboard, shall render all practical and necessary assistance to persons affected by the incident. Any person who complies with this provision in good faith and who renders assistance without objection of any person assisted shall not be held liable for any civil damages as a result of the rendering of assistance where he has acted as an ordinary, reasonably prudent man would have acted under the same or similar circumstances.

The Federal Boat Safety Act also contains provisions concerning the States. In addition to the Federal preemption clause for standards, the Act requires that:

1. All undocumented vessels equipped with propulsion machinery of any type shall have a number issued by the proper issuing authority in the State in which the vessel is principally used. It authorizes the formation of a standard numbering system for vessels and allows the numbering systems of individual States which are in accord with the standard numbering system to be approved by the Coast Guard.
2. It also states that any person may request from an issuing authority vessel numbering and registration information which is retrievable from the numbering system records of the issuing authority when the issuing authority is satisfied that the request is reasonable and related to a boating safety purpose.
3. The Act makes provisions for a direct financial grant in aid program to the States in order to encourage and assist the States in the develupment and implementation of Boating Safety Programs.
4. In order to encourage greater State participation and consistency in boating safety efforts and particularly greater safety patrol and enforcement activities, State Boating Safety Programs directed at implementing and supplementing the Act may be formally accepted by the Coast Guard. This acceptance is necessary for a State to receive full rather than partial Federal financial assistance.
5. The Act requires that the Coast Guard prescribe a uniform vessel casualty reporting system and states further that the vessel numbering systems and boating safety programs approved under this Act shall provide for the reporting of casualties and accidents involving vessels. It further requires that the States compile and transmit reports, information, and statistics on casualties and accidents reported to it.

Other provisions of the Federal Boat Safety Aet establish penalties both criminal and civil to handle violations of the Act's provisions and regulations issued under its
authority. Further, the Act states that compliance with this Act or standards, regulations, or orders promulgated hereunder shall not relieve any person from liability at common law or under State law. There are also miscellaneous provisions repealing portions of the Motorboat Act and the Federal Boating Act of 1958.
The reader is cautioned that the foregoing list of the Act's provisions is not all inclusive and is intended to indicate the scope of the Act rather than detailed requirements of it.

## Caast Guard Regulations

The Federal Boat Safety Act contains broad authority for action in the boating safety area and in some cases requires the issuance of regulations to supplement and implement the Act's authority. Since the passage of the Federal Boat Safety Act, the Coast Guard has been quite active in issuing this type of regulation. Table 1 shows the regulations which have been issued as of May $1,1973$.

## The Future of the Boating Standards' Program

The Boating Standards Program is established as a continuing effort. The initial standards and regulations which have thus far been promulgated under the Act's authority establish the basic skeleton for compliance with standards and for defect notification. The first group of standards (pointed primarily at reducing deaths from drowning) has been published and, with the exception of the standard requiring flotation of certain boats when flooded, is in effect. The flotation standard allows additional time before it becomes effective to allow for the redesign of boats necessary to meet its provisions.

The standards now in effect are based primarily on the work of the American Boat and Yacht Gouncil and of other voluntary programs, and reflect current practice in the industry. These standards are now under review, and in the future there will be revisions to increase their effectiveness. The standards apply to those groups of boats from which drownings most frequently accur but they do not include such craft as inflatable boats, canoes, and other craft where a similar hazard exists. Development of comparable standards for these groups of boats is also under way and these standards will be published in the near future.

There is a broad range of potential standards projects which are now being considered by the Coast Guard. The thrust of the standards development program is now to continue to analyze the specific hazards involved with the various types and classifications of recreational boats and equipment and to develop specific safety standards to meet these specific hazards. One question frequently asked is whether it is the Coast Guard's intention to establish broad construction standards similar to the Rules and Regulations for Commercial Vessels. This does not appear necessary since the basic structural integrity of the recreational boat is the responsibility of the manufacturer,
and his responsibilities under the "Notification of Defect; Repair or Replacement" provisions of the Federal Boat Safety Act offer assurance that any major defects which arise will be corrected.

## Conclusion

The Boating Standards Program and the provisions of the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 upon which it is based fill an important need-that of assuring that recreational boats and associated equipment are built to reasonable safety standards and are free from serious safety defects. But providing the boating public with safe boating equipment cannot in itself assure a high level of safety on the waters. The designer and the builder have little if any control over how their product will be used. Thus, it is equally important that the boatman be well educated as to his responsibilities and his rights while on the water. The third part of the boating safety picture is effective, con-
sistent law enforcement. Knowledgeable boatmen, effective law enforcement, and boats and equipment which are safe and suitable for their service insure that recreational boating is safe and enjoyable. The attainment of these goals is a difficult and demanding task. It requires the cooperation of the designers and builders of boats and equipment, the boatman who uses them, and local, State, and Federal Government. Everyone who designs, builds, or uses boats or is involved in the development or implementation of boating laws and regulations must have the total boating safety picture in mind at all times. Recreational boating is a leisure activity enjoyed by nearly one quarter of our nation's population. One of the major stated purposes of the Federal Boat Safety Act is to foster greater development, use and enjoyment of all the waters of the United States. This requires a safety program which will be effective while retaining and enhancing the attractiveness of recreational boating.

Table 1

| Regulation | Published in Federal Register | Effective Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P.F.D. interim regulations | Feb. 16, 1972 | Apr. 17, 1972 |
| Correction of especially hazardous conditions | July 7, 1972 | Aug. 7,1972 |
| Defect notification. | Aug. 4, 1972 | Sept. 3, 1972 |
| Manufacturers' requirements: (Certification of compliance; hull identification numbers; safe loading; safe powering; flotation; capacity information). | ....do....... | Nov. 1, $1972{ }^{1}$ |
| Numbering and casualty reporting................ | Oct. 7,1972 | July 1,1973 |
| P.F.D. final regulations | Mar. 28, 1973 | Oct. 1, 1973 |
| Preemption of State statutes and regulations concerning boat performance standards. | Mar. 14, 1973 | Mar. 14, 1973 |
| Proposed rulemaking on correction of especially hazardous conditions regarding recreational boats designated unsafe for specific voyages on specific bodies of water. | do |  |
| Proposed rulemaking on correction of especially hazardous conditions on certain river bars and coastal inlets along the States of Washington and Oregon. | do. |  |

: Compliance required by Aug. 1, 1973 for flotation.
Note: Proposed regulations to be coming in the near future.
Additional required equipment:
(1) Secondary means of propulsion for Class A boats;
(2) Dewatering devices (bailers/pumps).

## BOATING ACCIDENTS

For the calendar year 1972, 5,044 vessels were involved in 3,942 recreational boating accidents. These accidents resulted in 1,437 deaths, 829 injuries, and $\$ 7,107,000$ in property damage. The accompanying table details the results of boating accidents for the last five years.

## Loss of Life

Vessel capsizings continue to account for more lives lost in boating accidents than any other type of casualty; 615 vessels capsized in 1972, causing 574 fatalities. The vast majority of capsizings seems to be caused by some fault of the operator in the handling of his vessel. Foremost among these faults are: overloading or improper loading of the boat; lack of operating experience; ignoring weather warnings; and boating in adverse weather.

## Personal Injuries

Collisions with other boats or with a fixed object continue to account for more of the personal injuries than any other type of casualty. A total of 2599 vessels were involved in collisions, causing 344 injuries. The principal cause of these collisions was the failure of the operator to maintain a proper lookout. The increasing popularity of
water skiing has contributed to this safety problem. Also, 357 fires or explosions on vessels resulted in the second largest number of personal injuries: 102.

## Property Damage

Fires and explosions continue to account for the greatest amount of property damage, with vessel collisions responsible for the second largest amount, $\$ 2,198,000$ was lost due to fires and explosions while $\$ 2,045,000$ worth of property damage was caused by collisions with other vessels or fixed objects. The majority of fires and explosions where the cause of the accident could be determined were due to: operator negligence, disregard for safe fueling practices, and lack of operating experience.

## Weather and Water Conditions

Of the waters that vessels were on at the times of the reportable accidents: $56.7 \%$ were nontidal waters; $32.5 \%$ were tidal waters; $5.6 \%$ were on the Great Lakes; and $5.2 \%$ were on the oceans or the Gulf of Mexico.

The weather and water conditions at the times vessels became involved in accidents show that in $55.9 \%$ of the cases the water was calm; in $77.8 \%$ of the cases the weather was clear; in $62.7 \%$ of the eases there was
little or no wind; and in $78.6 \%$ of the cases the visibility was good.

Time, Day of the Week, and Month

A larger percentage of vessels $(19.1 \%)$ were involved in accidents between the hours of 2 pm to 4 pm than in any other two-hour interval. The time periods of 2 pm to 4 pm and 4 pm to 6 pm were tied for the highest percentage of fatalities with $17.3 \%$ each.

The highest percentage of vessel accidents ( $30.3 \%$ ) occurred on Sundays, followed closely by Saturdays ( $26.6 \%$ ). However, Saturday had a higher percentage of fatalities than did Sunday ( $27.8 \%$ for the former; $25.6 \%$ for the latter).

Accidents befell vessels most frequently in the months of July, August, and June, with $25 \%, 15.7 \%$, and $14.2 \%$ respectively. The largest percentage of fatalities occurred during the month of July ( $15.7 \%$ ). May and June followed, with $14.5 \%$ of the deaths occurring in each of those two months.

For more detailed information on recreational boating statistics, copies of BOATING STATISTICS-1972 ( $C G-357$ ) are available to all interested parties. Write to: U.S. Coast Guard (GBD-2), 400 Seventh Street S.W., Washington, D.G. 20590.

| TYPES OF CASUALTY | RESULTS OF BOATING ACCIDENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FATALITIES |  |  |  |  | INJURIES |  |  |  |  | AMOUNT OF DAMAGE <br> (DOLLARS) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 |
| Grounding | ${ }^{61}{ }^{6}$ | 22 562 | 7 569 | 659 | 15 | 46 | 38 64 | 28 58 | 20 | 53 | 597,100 | 855,700 | 590,000 | 1,040,000 | 867,000 |
| Capsizing | 610 37 | 562 66 | 569 | 659 82 | 574 81 81 | 97 | 64 9 | 52 7 | $\begin{array}{r}74 \\ 8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 80 13 | 367,800 | 324,900 249,000 | 348,000 419,000 | 692,000 | 350,000 355,000 |
| Flooding | 37 108 | 66 50 | 128 60 | 82 63 | 81 68 | 26 | 9 <br> 19 | 6 | 88 | 13 | 137,900 | 249,000 475,300 | 419,000 260,000 | 323,000 534,000 | 355,000 720,000 |
| Sinking ${ }^{\text {Fire }}$ Explosion of Fuel | 108 17 | 50 14 | 21 | 63 18 | 16 | 206 | 155 | 160 | 123 | 97 | 2,047,700 | 1,885,300 | 3, 044,000 | 2,704,000 | 1,884,000 |
| Fire or Explosion of Fuel Qther Fire or Explosion | 17 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 206 | 155 | 11 | 123 | 5 | 2,985,000 | 239,800 | 3,965,000 | 1,767,000 | 1,315,000 |
| Collision with Another Vessel | 59 | 45 | 55 | 83 | 64 | 413 | 310 | 232 | 350 | 237 | 1,147,8001 | 1,082,000 | 1,148,000 | 987,000 | 1,636,000 |
| Collision with Fixed Object | 58 | 47 | 62 | 61 | 55 | 143 | 156 | 99 | 120 | 107 | 535,000 | 804,700 | 686,000 | 568,000 | 410,000 |
| Striking Floating Object | 22 | 23 | 25 | 20 | 37 | 26 | 29 | 24 | 22 | 26 | 160,700 | 321,700 | 505,000 | 280,000 | 326,000 |
| Other Casualty to Vessel | 38 | 23 | 24 | 55 | 43 | 20 | 24 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 135,000 | 104,800 | 177,000 | 44,000 | 136,000 |
| Falls Overboard | 315 | 351 | 348 | 336 | 337 | 87 | 46 | 36 | 38 | 58 | 2,000 | 16,100 | 25,000 | 17,000 | 9,000 |
| Falls Within Boat | ${ }_{14}^{2}$ |  |  | $1 \frac{1}{3}$ |  | 15 83 | 7 4 | 9 46 | 10 24 | $\begin{array}{r}3 \\ 5 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Struck by Boat or Propeller Other Personnel Casually | 14 56 | 10 135 | 102 | 174 174 | 16 127 | $\begin{array}{r}83 \\ 102 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 47 95 | 46 61 | 24 79 | 57 72 | 100 | 500 11,200 | 6,000 | 9,000 57,000 | 99,000 |
| total | 1342 | 1350 | 1418 | 1582 | 1437 | 1284 | 1004 | 780 | 897 | 829 | 6,631,600 | 6,371,900 | 8,173,000 | 9,022,000 | 7,107,000 |

## BOATING SAFETY ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Boating Safety Advisory Council was established under the authority of the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971. The Council serves as a deliberative body advising the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard on matters concerning recreational boating safety. It consists of 21 members having particular expertise, knowledge, and experience in boating safety, drawn equally, insofar as practical, from: (1) State officials responsible for State boating programs; (2) boat and associated equipment manufacturers; and (3) boating organizations and members of the general public. Each year the appointment terms for seven members expire resulting in the rotation of approximately one-third of the membership to provide the broadest possible representation of the varying interests and continuity.
The present Council members and year their appointment expires are as follows: Chairman, Mr. Edward J. Heine, Jr., President, United States Lines, New York, N.Y., 1973; Mr. John E. Bennett, Director, California Department of Navigation and Ocean Development, 1975; Mr. Norman C. Blanchard, President, Blanchard Boat Company, Seattle, Washington, 1973; Mr. Robert W. Dyke, Administrator, Marine Safety Section, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, 1975; Mr. David L. Gamble, Harbor Woods, Michigan, 1975; Mr. William D. Gaston, Executive Vice President, Glastron Boat Company, Austin, Texas, 1975; Mr. William A. Getz, President, Williams, White \& Company, Moline, Illinois, 1975; Mr. Howard Larson, Vice President, Outboard Marine Corporation, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1974; Mr. Robert C. Lowry, Vice President \& Manager Marine Office, Appleton \& Cox Corporation, New York, N.Y., 1973; Mr. James R. McQueen, Jr., President, Trojan Yacht, Lancaster, Pennsyl-
vania, 1973; Mr. Donald A. Milton, General Manager, Marine \& Industrial Products Operations, Chrysler Corporation, Detroit, Michigan, 1974; Mrs. Marianne Napier, Marketing \& Dealer Services Director, International Marine Expositions, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, 1975; Mr. James J. O'Brien, Director, New York State Division of Marine \& Recreational Vehicles, 1973; Mr. George H. Page, President, Marmac Products, Inc., Cleveland Ohio, 1974; Mr. Robert F. Rittenhouse, Director, Oregon State Marine Board, 1973; Mr. Robertson Ross, Vice President \& General Manager, Lake Washington Yacht Basin, Inc., Seattle, Washington, 1974; Mr. F. Ritter Shumway, Chairman \& Chief Executive Officer, Sybron Corporation, Rochester, New York, 1974; Mr. Alvin Simon, President, Sodibar Systems of D.C., Inc., Washington, D.C., 1973; Mr. Ralph


Edward J. Heine, Jr., Chairman, Boating Safety Advisory Council.

Thacher, Vice President, Burr Brothers Boats, Marion, Massachusetts, 1975; Mrs. Florence B. Wade, Supervisor, Commonwealth of Virginia Boat Registrations, 1974.

While the Council has no operating authority or responsibility, it provides the Coast Guard with invaluable advice and assistance in considering the following:

1. The need for and the extent to which the regulations of and the standards for the boating industry will contribute to boating safety.
2. Whether any proposed regulation or standard is reasonable and appropriate for the particular type of boat or associated equipment for which it is prescribed.
3. Relevant available boating safety standards, statistics and data, including public and private research, development, testing and evaluation.

In addition, the Council advises the Commandant on any other major hoat safety matters referred to it.

The Council, now in its second year, has operated since its inception under the very capable leadership of the Chairman, Mr. Edward J. Heine, Jr . Throughout the first year of operation, Chairman Heine and the Council members were supplied with preliminary drafts of proposed standards for safe loading, safe powering, capacity information, proposed regulations for certification of compliance, defect notification, hull identification numbers, correction of especially hazardous conditions (termination of unsafe use), vessel numbering and casualty reporting and interim lifesaving equipment requirements. The Council supplied many beneficial comments and suggestions and agreed that the need for these standards and regulations had been adequately demonstrated. Each one of the aforementioned standards and regulations was then published in the Federal

Register as a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, followed by a comment making period and a public hearing. All comments received during this period were evaluated and taken into consideration when the respective final rule was issued with Council concurrence.

At the Council's January 16-17, 1973 meeting in Miami Beach, Florida it concurred with the Coast Guard that the existing especially hazardous conditions should be amended to prohibit certain boats from crossing the bars along the coast of Oregon and Washington during periods of adverse weather and empower the Coast Guard District Cornmanders to terminate the use of unique vessels (bathtubs, etc.) for extended voyages. The Council concurred that the following existing regulations should be amended. Flotation and display of capacity information for safe loading and safe powering standards should exempt certain unique vessels such as air cushion vehicles and all terrain vehicles; capacity information regulations
should be changed to allow a manufacturer to show both the horsepower capacity for remote and non-remote steering on boats that may possibly be used either way. The Council concurred that it is desirable to remove regulations governing whistles and sound signals, backfire flame control, and firefighting equipment for recreational boats from 46 CFR Subchapter " C " and incorporate them in 33 CFR Subchapter "S". The Council agreed that a need for new standards regulations that would establish an engine identification system, require capacity information for safe loadings, safe powering and flotation in a flooded condition for inflatable boats, and require maximum safe loading capacities for canoes had been adequately demonstrated. The Council also concurred with the proposed additional equipment requirement regulations which would require a secondary means of propulsion (paddle/oar) and a dewatering device (bailer/pump) for certain boats.

The Council has a three member education committee which is study-
ing the problem of voluntary versus mandatory boating safety education, and the question of operator licensing. This committee is making excellent progress with its in-depth study and reports its findings regularly to the full Council.

In compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, a Notice of Open Meeting is published in the Federal Register prior to each Council meeting. The public is invited to attend.

Any member of the public who wishes to do so may file a written statement with the Council, before or after the meeting, or may present an oral statement with the advance approval of the chairman. Interested persons may request additional information concerning meetings and other matters relating to the Boating Safety Advisory Council from D. F. Lauth, Captain, USCG, Executive Director, Boating Safety Advisory Council, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters (GBL/62), 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590 or by calling 202-426-1060.

# Distress Signals for the Recreational Boatman 

The Office of Boating Safety, U.S. Coast Guard, is focusing its attention on yet another area concerning the recreational boatman: the question of mandatory carriage of visual distress signals. The professional mariner recognized this need many years ago, a need based on a solid background of experience and expertise in an always rigorous and often dangerous profession.

The Coast Guard has been keeping a wary eye on the other user of the waters-the recreational boatman. We have watched him grow in number to his present size: over 46 mil-
lion. And, there are some 7.6 million boats of all sizes. Furthermore, the number of boatmen is growing at the rate of 7 or 8 percent per year. Other growth rates which are being watched carefully are the number of search and rescue (SAR) incidents, the number of accidents, deaths, and injuries, and the dollar value of property damage or loss involving the recreational boatman. SAR incidents are running well over 30 thousand per year, and increasing at the rate of approximately 6 percent annually. The number of deaths has hovered near 1500 for the past 3 years, with a fewer number of injuries. Property damage costs have ranged between 7 and 9 million dollars during this same period.

The Coast Guard is striving to reverse the general upward trend of these accident statistics through safety improvements in boats and related equipment, greatly increased emphasis on public education, and through the required carriage of certain equipment or devices, among which might be the visual distress signal.

The comments of the professional mariner concerning the type of distress signal that should be carried, who should carry it, when and where it should be carried would be most helpful to the Coast Guard in its effort to resolve this long-standing question. All comments and suggestions will be welcome, and should be addressed to: U.S. Coast Guard (CBBE-3/62), 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.


## NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AUXILIARY PROGRAM

Established by Congress in 1939 to assist the Coast Guard in promoting boating safety, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary has over 35,000 members in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Auxiliarists are active in three major areas: Public Education, Courtesy Motorboat Examinations, and Operations. 1973 will see new developments in all areas, as the Auxiliary adapts its programs to the changing character of recreational boating.

The Auxiliary is probably best known for the boating classes it presents to the public. Auxiliary instructors offer 12-lesson and 3-lesson courses in boating safety and seamanship, a seven-lesson course in safe sailing, and a one-lesson course for hunters and fishermen. Records indicate that the Auxiliary enrolled over 311,000 students in public education classes last year, with nearly 75,000 of those in the advanced courses that cover boathandling, legal requirements, rules of the road, piloting, marine engines, sailing, weather, and communications. Now that the advanced courses are catching on ( $40 \%$ increase in enrollments last year), the Auxiliary is turning its attention to the small outboard boatman, who may not go boating more than a few times a year, and who may be reluctant to spend a lot of time in a comprehensive course. To reach this rapidly growing group, the Auxiliary
has developed a new, compact, onelesson course for the small boatman in the basics of safe boating.

The course is called the Skipper's Outboard Special, and includes a narrative, a supplementary slide presentation, and a programmed learning text for the student to work on at home to help him retain what he has learned. Each of the Auxiliary's nearly 1200 flotillas will have a set of slides and will be teaching the course this spring and suminer. Although intended as an introductory course that will encourage students to sign up for additional courses, the Skipper's Outboard Special provides excellent coverage of legal requirements, rules of the road, proper loading and fueling procedures, and potentially hazardous situations.

The corresponding small boat program in the Auxiliary's vessel examination effort is the Class A Federal Equipment Check. The traditional Auxiliary program in this area has been the Courtesy Motorboat Examination (CME). Qualified Auxiliarists examine boats at the owner' request, checking for the availability of required safety equipment and additional equipment recommended by the Auxiliary. Although the CME has by no means excluded small boats, Class A boats (under 16 feet) are often not equipped to meet the stringent requirements., The Federal Equipment Check will check these motorboats for federal equipment requirements, and should attract many boatmen not previously reached by a boating safety program.

The third area of Auxiliary activity is Operations. The Auxiliary assisted nearly 36,000 persons last year, saving 368 lives and close to $\$ 70,000,000$ in property value. Although the Auxiliary's participation in operations is primarily in the areas of patrols and search and rescue, the Auxiliary's assistance missions do change as recreational boating changes. As concern for the environment becomes a national issue, the Auxiliary is being drawn into this new field of activity, and Auxiliarists have already demonstrated their ability to respond quickly and effectively to a new kind of emergency.

March 9, 1973, a tanker collided. with a barge outside Houston, Texas, spilling over 400,000 gallons of oil into Houston harbor. Auxiliary flotillas nearby provided immediate assistance. Vessel facilities patrolled the outer harbor warning boatmen of the hazard. While one Auxiliary boat served as the Communications Center for the On-Scene-Commander, another with radar equipment assisted the $30^{\prime}$ Coast Guard utility boats not equipped with radar, through fog to the scene. Another Auxiliarist is credited with managing the initial public relations effort with the news media, providing UPI, AP, TV stations, radio stations, and newspapers with current information concerning the spill and clean-up operation. The vessels, personnel, and communications equipment and expertise contributed during the emergency were invaluable in coordinating the cleanup effort.

## THOSE DAM ACCIDENTS

Many needless deaths are still occurring on waters above and below dams, in spite of attempts to make boatmen aware of the dangers. For the purpose of this article, a study was made of six reports of accidents that resulted from boating or fishing too close to dams last year.

One incident above a dam involved two men who went canoeing late one afternoon, after work. It was dark when they neared their destination; however, not knowing the precise location of a particular dam, the two men drifted into the rushing waters and lost control of the canoe. One of the men was killed as the craft was swept over the spillway. A contributing factor in this accident was the lack of lighted signs and safety cables in the area of the dam.

In another case, a twenty-year-old college student took a 26 foot, single operator's scull into the turbulent waters of a river to practice rowing. She drifted too close to a dam, and, probably recognizing her predicament, dived from the boat in an attempt to swim to shore, a distance of 15 yards. The force of the water was too much for the girl, however; her body was recovered sometime later . . . below the dam.

Subsequent investigation revealed that a "safety wire" which normally stretched across the river above the dam, had been partially carried away at the point where the young student went over. Nevertheless, she was guilty of an error in judgment by failing to assess the prevailing water conditions and by disregarding her proximity to the dam.

In the third case, a party of four aboard a fifteen-foot, thirty-five horsepower motorboat approached a dam at about fifteen miles per hour. When they were within fifty feet of the dam,
the operator attempted to alter his course, but the boat did not respond. The craft crashed through the "flash boards" atop the dam, and one of the four persons was killed as the boat plummeted to the waters below.

Not all accidents occur above a dam, however. In fact, there is a higher rate of drownings in the ever more dangerous waters below a darn where sportsmen are lured by an abundance of fish.

In one incident last year, a fourteen foot, ten horsepower motorboat with two people aboard capsized when hydroelectric turbines automatically began to operate. One occupant survived by clinging to a nearby rock; the other occupant (reportedly a good swimmer) was less fortunate.

Cause of this casualty? Negligent operation by deliberately entering a clearly advertised dangerous area.

The second case occurring below a dam involved three persons aboard a fifteen foot, sixty-five horsepower motorboat. The party were fishing in the spillway area when they drifted too close to a discharge and were caught in the heavy turbulence. The small boat crashed into the dam and capsized. All three occupants drowned. There was no safety chain or wire to grasp; however, large signs on the dam and below the dam warned boats to stay clear. Again, the casualties could be attributed to negligence on the part of the operator.

The final example involved a pontoon boat twenty feet in length and propelled by a twenty-five horsepower motor. The boat was equipped with remote steering, but lacked a remote engine starter. The three men aboard the boat had been fishing in one spot for some time before they moved to a point immediately below an island on one side of the spillway,
beyond the sign area. As they approached their anchor point, the engine was cut and the anchor (a tractor flywheel and 100 feet of steel cable) was dropped; but, the river bottom was hard and smooth, the anchor did not hold, and the boat kept moving! They were being swept stem first toward the dam's spillway. The men tried to restart the engine, but it was not powerful enough to act against the current and the craft kept moving toward the dam. The stern struck the huoyed cable, and in the jostling that occurred, the boat capsized. Two of the men on board who were thrown from the craft clung to the cable and were rescued; the third, who remained within the boat, was drowned.

In this last case, signs were posted at each end of the buoyed cable. The primary cause of this casualty was operating in turbulent waters where the current was opposite in direction to that expected (i.e., toward the dam, rather than down river). A contributing cause was an insufficient anchor for conditions encountered. Also revealed by subsequent investigation was the fact that the drowning victim, a man in poor health, who could not swim, was not wearing a PFD.

From these six cases, we learn of the need for safety cables or wires both above and below dams. In addition, we see the possible need fur more visible warning signs (at least one at the dam, two in the area of the safety cable, and two beyond). Of course, better education of the boatman is also imperative, as is the need to develop some new and innovative methods of warning those persons who venture into these hazardous waters. It is a task (and a problem) to be shared mutually by those agencies involved in dam safety and boating safety, and by the boatman as well.

## Education and Training

WHOEVER SAID, "Those who can, do; those who can't, teach", certainly wasn't thinking about the U.S. Coast Guard. In the past year, the Office of Buating Safety has continued to improve its educational offerings using its expert boating savvy. The Education Division of the Office of Boating Safety is always on the lookout for innovative and effective ways to cut down the toll of death and property destruction on our nation's waterways. There are two main areas of concern: public boating safety education for the recreational boatmen and training for Coast Guard boating safety personnel. We use a mixture of movies, courses, and puhlications to achieve our goals.

In the area of public education, there are two new movies available: one is about safe boat trailering and the other is about portable marine fire extinguishers. The trailering movie was made by a commercial producer in cooperation with the Coast Guard. Entitled, "It's Not Where You're Going. . . But How You Get There", this movie covers the importance of trailer selection, loading, pretrip inspection, handling on the highway, boat launching, and recovery. The film is embellished with guest appearances by Admiral Wagner and Astronaut Scott Garpenter. This movie plugs what had been a big gap in our boating education coverage.
The second movie fills a long standing need for a visible vehicle to explain in simple terms the federal requirements for marine portable fire extinguishers on recreational boats. Both the script and the acting are products of the staff of the Boating Education Division. The movie is called, "What Now, Skipper?", and it incorporates a successful blend of entertainment and education. The movie follows the antics of a stumbling skipper as he tries to extinguish each of the classes of fires aboard his boat. Along the way, some hard information about the different types of extinguishers, their use, mainte-
nance, stowage, and capabilities is presented to the viewer. Amidst fires, puns, and demonstrations, the educational message is always present. This has to be a good movie-we can't keep enough copies in stock!

Another movie is in the development stage. Since federal regulations for personal flotation devices (PFDs) have changed, we need a movie to help publicize and teach the new regulations. Consequently, we have written a script for a PFD movie, and we hope to have the movie ready by fall. In this film, a dream effect will pull a man and his wife back to colonial America where they will learn the ins and outs of the "revolutionary regulations."

Fact and humor, entertainment and education; that's the framework we work with. After all, there are 46 million boatmen out there, and each year 700,000 more take to the water. As of yet, we don't have the power or the inclination to force any of them to learn safe boating. But we do our best to entice, cajole, and persuade them to learn. By making learning pleasant and enjoyable, we've been able to educate many more boatmen than we have in the past.

It was the success of "(Almost) Everything You Ever Wanted to Know about Boating . . . But Were Ashamed to Ask", a programmed learning pamphlet that mixed humor and fact, that pointed us in the direction of our current educational efforts. This pamphlet was introduced last year as a basic guide to safe boating. Now it is also being printed by the Boating Industry Association, who is selling it even at a loss to marine dealers, insurance companies, and boat manufacturers. They, in turn, distribute it free of charge to boatmen. So far, 1.5 million copies of this pamphlet have been printed.

The only drawback of "(Almost) Everything . . ." is its short length. To meet the demand for a more comprehensive course on boating safety, we devised "The Skipper's Course". This is annther programmed learning text, designed for the boatman who
doesn't have access to a classroom course. For $\$ 1.50$, anybody can get a copy if he writes: "The Skipper's Course", Box 1821, Washington, D.C. 20013. From October 1972, when it went on the market, to April 1973, 40,000 copies have been sold, despite the lack of a major publicity campaign.

The Salty Dog Coloring Book will soon be available for distribution to the children of recreational boatmen. A handy, colorful pamphlet explaining the new PFD regulations is going to be ready in May. Another pamphlet will be out at the same time to push a new safety program-the Federal Equipment Check. This check is a free examination for boats under 16 feet to see if they meet federal requirements. Those who pass will get a snappy decal. The FEC pamphlet will publicize the desirability and availability of this safety exam.
Last summer, we used the Coast Guard Reserve to test an audio-visual course for the new outboard boatmen. We call it the SOS Course. Over the winter we modified and improved the course, and it's ready for a full bell effort this summer. Less than two hours in length, the course covers the essentials of boat safety, and it encourages the student to take a more detailed course for his own good. It will be taught by the Coast Guard Reserve and the Coast Guard Auxiliary, but any interested organization can buy the course materials from the National Audio/Visual Center in Washington, D.C. 20409 at a cost of $\$ 28.50$ (includes manual and over 200 slides).

So much for public education. We also provide our own people with considerable boating safety training. Naturally, since our people teach the public and enforce federal boating laws, the training they receive is extremely comprehensive. We don't want to bore Coast Guardsmen any more than we want to bore the public, so we include visual aids in their curriculum, as well. Already filmed and in use is a movie about proper boarding techniques for the boating
safety officer. This film demonstrates how to board and examine a boat quickly, efficiently, and without offending the public. Not much humor here, but there are some girls. We are currently making a film on how to properly use our authority to correct especially hazardous conditions. The movie emphasizes the need to rely on experience and judgment before deciding to terminate the use of a boat. The attention-holding factor in this film is the character whose boat exhibits the eight unsafe conditions which can be the cause for termination.

In addition to these movies, we have designed three educational courses which qualify Coast Guardsmen for designation as a boating safety officer. The first is the successful completion of a six-week course of instruction at the National Boating Safety School in Yorktown, Virginia. Combining classroom with on-the-water work, this school thoroughly prepares a man for the duties of a Coast Guard Boating Safety Officer. The School is also open to state boating law officials as is the second way-the Boating Safety correspondence course. The third way is a $32-$ hour course designed to be taught to men at Coast Guard units whose schedules and duties do not allow them to attend the school at Yorktown.

This has been a brief rundown of the cducational and training materials put out by the Office of Boating Safety. No doubt, there will be
more such materials in the future. We are always open to constructive suggestions and comments that might
help us in our mission: to educate the public and train the Coast Guardsman.


Salty Dog and Wally Whale saying that "You will never see Ann Apple turn over." These are two of the characters in the new coloring book, designed by the Office of Boating Safety.

## National Safe

## Boating Week

This summer, the week from 1 July through 7 July, has been proclaimed by the President of the United States as NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK. This observance has been set aside to emphasize to the recreational boating public that boat-
ing can be safe and enjoyable. Too many recreational boatmen today feel that since they can afford a boat, they instinctively inherit a feeling for the water and the boat. This is evidenced by the number of U.S. Coast Guard search and rescue missions involving boating accidents and the number of boating fatalities filed.

To coordinate the promotion of this nationally proclaimed week, 7,200 promotion kits will be distributed
through the twenty-one member organizations. Each member organization works through its field units in pursuing and promoting local support of National Safe Boating Week. The National Safe Boating Committee works on a national level seeking support from various organizations in promoting boating safety. State governments are also requested to issue proclamations on State Safe Boating Weeks.

# Boating Safety Information Report 

IN JUNE, 1971, the Office of Boating Safety embarked on a national public information marketing plan, designed to make the American boating public "safety" conscious. The marketing plan was created to become effective in the wake of the passage of the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971.

Employing many public communications channels, the Office of Boating Safety, in coordination and cooperation with the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the American National Red Cross, the state boating authorities, and private boating safety organizations, created and produced three separate "campaigns".

The first campaign promoted the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, U.S. Power Squadron, and Red Cross formal boating classes given throughout the United States. The second campaign concentrated on Coast Guard requirements for recreational boat-
men. In this instance, the main "peg" was the wearing of personal flotation devices. A recycle of the course enrollment campaign was the third project. These three campaigns spanned August, 1971 through February, 1973. In May of this year, a fourth campaign was initiated to publicize the new personal flotation device regulations, as well as promote Courtesy Motorboat Examinations and Federal Equipment Checks given free to reereational boat owners as a public service.

An analysis of the first three informational campaigns has shown that they were effective in promoting basic boating safety information. The U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary reported that classroom attendance in boating courses increased by $40 \%$ over the preceding year. The Power Squadrons reported an enrollment increase in their courses of some $30 \%$. Accident and casualty statistics from recreational boating accidents were on the decline, in spite of the fact that the number of hoatmen has been increasing.

In terms of media cooperation, the Office of Boating Safety is pleased
with the amount of air time donated as a public service by radio and television stations. Three TV spot announcements were distributed to 280 television stations and radio announcements were sent to some 5600 AM and FM radio stations. Business reply cards, returned to the Coast Guard by the broadcast outlets indicate that the material was receiving a $40 \%$ average station usage. [Standard Rate and Data Journal, the National Association of Broadcasters placement "Bible" estimates that a $10 \%$ return on public service material is considered an excellent media response.]

Various local press outlets and six national magazines have carried Coast Guard produced safety ads as a public service. All totaled, it is estimated that the original investment returned over one million dollars worth of public service time to the Coast Cuard.

Present plans call for a stepped-up informational program which will now include closer recreational marine industry participation in funding, production and placement of boating safety material.

"What now, Skipper?", the recently-produced film on recreational boat fires is seen, here, in production. It is one of the most popular films to have been produced by the Office of Boating Safety.

## COAST GUARD RULEMAKING

（Status as of 1 May 1973）

|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 능 } \\ & \text { 皆 } \\ & \text { 品 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { 总 } \\ & \text { 苟 } \\ & \text { 荡 } \end{aligned}$ | 0 3 咢 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1972 PUBLIC HEARING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tailshaft inspection and drawing（67－71，4－71） | 3－1－72 | 3－27－72 | 4－3－72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Stability－wind heel criteria for cargo and miscellancous vessels（43－71）． | 3－1－72 | 3－27－72 | 4－3－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Definition of international voyage（12－70）．．．．．．．．．．．． | $3-1-72$ | 3－27－72 | 4－3－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Portable foam firefighting equipment－tank vessels（17－ $71)$. | 3－1－72 | 3－27－72 | 4－3－72 | $\times$ | ．．．．．．．．．．．． |  |  |
| ANCHORAGE REGULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casco Bay，Maine | 6－16－72 |  | 7－19－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Henderson Harbor， N | 6－28－72 |  | 8－1－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| St．John＇s River，Fla．（CGFR 71－162） | 12－22－71 |  | 1－31－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| San Juan Harbor，P．R．（CGFR 72－12） | 2－1－72 |  | 3－4－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Willington River，Ga．（CGFR 71－153） | 11－25－71 |  | 12－27－71 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| San Diego Harbor（CGD 72－228）； | 12－5－72 | None | 1－8－73 | $\times$ | ．$\cdot$ ． |  |  |
| Hampton Roads，VA（CGD 72－232） | 12－5－72 |  | 1－9－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Juan De Fuca，Wash．（CGD 72－233） | 12－5－72 |  | 1－9－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Hampton Roads，VA（CGD 72－239） | 12－10－72 |  | 1－11－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Chester River，Md．（CGD 73－10）． | 1－19－73 |  | 2－27－73 |  |  |  |  |
| Milwaukee Harbor WI（CGD 73－48） | 3－19－73 |  | 4－16－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Barbers Point，Oahu，HI（CGD 73－59 | 3－30－73 |  | 4－20－73 | x |  |  |  |
| Sodus Bay，NY（CGD 73－84）．．．．．．． | 4－27－73 |  | 5－29－73 |  |  |  |  |
| BOATING SAFETY（GENERAL） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Numbering and casualty reporting（CGD 72－54）cor－ rected；F．R．of 11－17－72 | 4－19－72 | 5－17－72 | 5－31－72 |  |  | 10－7－72 | 7－1－73 |
| Personal Flotation Devices（CGD 72－172，120，163）．．．． | 10－6－72 | 11－20－72 |  |  |  | 3－28－73 | 10－1－73 |
| Personal Flotation Devices，supplementary（CGD 72－ 120）． | 1－5－73 |  | 1－30－73 | ．．．． |  | 3－28－73 | 10－1－73 |
| Termination of unique vessels（CGD 73－40）．．．．．．．．．． | 3－14－73 | 5－6－73 | 5－14－73 |  |  |  |  |
| Hazardous bar areas（CGD 73－41） | 8－14－73 | $\begin{gathered} 4-17 \& \\ 19-73 \end{gathered}$ | 5－1－73 | X |  |  |  |
| ，BRIDGE REGULATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bear Creek，Md．（CGFR 72－17） | $2-2-72$ |  | $3-7-72$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Chattahoochee River（CGFR 71－166）．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | $12-29-71$ | $1-26-72$ <br> Florida | 1－27－72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Idaho State Memorial Bridge，Clearwater River， Lewiston，Idaho（CGFR 71－169）． | 12－29－71 | 2－1－72 | 2－1－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Interatate I－90 at Lake Washington（CGFR 71－168）．．．． | 12－21－71 |  | 1－27－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | Washing－ ton |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raritan R．，N．J．（CGD 72－219） | 11－8－72 | 12－14－72 | 12－29－72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Nansemond R，，Va（CGD 72－244）． | 11－11－72 |  | 12－15－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| John Day R．，Blind Slough，Clatskanic R．，Oregon（CGD 72－231）． | 11－28－72 |  | 1－2－73 | $\times$ |  |  | $\because$ |
| Nanticoke，Del．（CGFR 71－142）．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 11－24－71 |  | 12－24－71 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Ogden Slip，Chicago，ill．（CGFR 72－16）．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | $2-2-72$ |  | $3-7-72$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Sacramento River，Cal．（CGFR 71－165）．．．．．．．． | 12－29－71 |  | 2－7－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Union Pacific RR Co．，Columbia River（CGFR 71－167）． | 12－29－71 | $2-23-72$ <br> Wash－ ington | 1－27－72 | $\times$ |  |  | ．．．．．．．．． |
| Ohio River at Huntington | 6－10－72 | 7－13－72 | 7－27－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Ortega River，Fla．．．． | 6－21－72 |  | 7－25－72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Clear Creek，Tex．（CGD 72－165P） | 8－26－72 |  | 10－3－72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| New River，Fla．（CGD 72－170P）．．．3 | 8－30－72 | ．．．．．．．．．． | 10－3－72 | $\times$ |  |  | ．．．．．．．．．． |
| Pompano Beach，Fla．（CGD 72－158P）． | $8-22-72$ $8-26-72$ |  | 9－26－72 $10-3-72$ | － |  |  |  |


| * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Palm Beach, Fla. (CGD 72-167P). Back Bay of Biloxi, Miss. (CG 72-173R). | 8-26-72 |  | 10-3-72 | $x$ |  | 9-7-72 <br> Extended <br> 4-2-73 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-2-72 } \\ & \text { through } \\ & 10-19-73 \end{aligned}$ |
| Great Canal, Satellite Beach, Brevard County, Fla: (CGD 72-175PH). | 9-13-72 | 10-30-72 | 11-13-72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Drawbridge Operations: <br> AIWW, Mile 342, Fla.; Drawbridge Operations (CGD 72-190P). | 9-30-72 |  | 11-1-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Barnegat Day, N.J. (CGD 72-21i) | 10-31-72 |  | 12-5-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Ewing Narrows, Harpswell, Me. (CGD $72-205$ ) | 10-17-72 | 11-21-72 | 12-6-72 | $\times$ |  |  | 2-14-73 |
| Richardson Bay, Ca. (CGD 72-30). |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | through $10-6-73$ |
| Doctors Pres, Naples, Fla. (CGD 72-242) | 12-16-72 | 1-25-73 | 2-15-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| AIWW Vero Deach, FL (CGD 72-155). | 3-2-73 |  | 4-3-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Menominee River, WI (CGD 73-12). | 1-26-73 |  | 3-6-73 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Spa Creek, MD (CGD 73-13). | 1-26-73 |  | 3-6-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Long Island Inland Waterway (CGD 73-23) | 2-12-73 |  | 3-30-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Shaws Cove, CT (CGD 73-72)............ | $4-\mathrm{i} \hat{8}-73$ |  | 5-18-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| HAZARDOUS MATERIALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compressed Gas Cylinders (CGD 72-115PH) | 8-31-72 | 9-28-72 | 10-2-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Dangerous Cargoes-Dichlorobutene (CGD 72-162PH). | 8-30-72 | 10-24-72 | 10-31-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Dichlorobutene, Corrected, F.R. 9-20-72, Hazardous Cargoes (CGD 72-162PH). | 8-30-72 | 10-24-72 | 10-31-72 | x |  |  |  |
| Certilication of Cargo Containers for Transport under Customs Seal (CGD 72-139). | 11-17-72 |  | 12-19-72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Metal Borings, Shavings, Turnings \& Cuttings (CGD 72-229) | 12-5-72 | 1-11-73 | 3-1-73 | x |  |  |  |
| Exemption to Etiologic Agents Requirements (CGD 72226). | 12-13-72 | 1-23-73 | 1-30-73 |  |  | 3-29-73 | 6-30-73 |
| Shipment of DOD material sold to shipper (CGD 73-42). | 3-22-73 | 4-17-73 | 4-24-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Miscellaneous Dangerous Cargoes (CGD 72-182)...... | 11-11-72 | 12-12-72 | 12-19-72 | $\times$ | , |  |  |
| MARINE ENVIRONMENT AND SYSTEMS (GENERAL) |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Oil pollution prevention (CGFR 71-160, 161).......... | 12-24-71 | 2-15-72 | 4-21-72 |  |  | 12-21-72 | 7-1-74 |
| Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Vero Beach, Fla. (CGD 72-155P). | 8-16-72 |  | 9-19-72 | x |  |  |  |
| : MERCHANT MARINE SAFETY (GENERAL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buoyant devices, apecial purpose water safety (CGFR 72-5). | 1-29-72 |  | 3-15-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Fire extinguishers, marine type portable (CGFR 72-36). | 3-9-72 | 4-18-72 | 4-24-72 |  |  | 3-14-73 | 6-18-73 |
| Incombustible materials (CGFR 72-47)............ | 3-9-72 | 4-18-72 | 4-24-72 |  |  | 3-14-73 | 6-18-73 |
| Oceanos raphic vessels, fire main systems (CGFR 72-20). | 2-4-72 |  | 3-19-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Washror $m$ and toilet facilities (CGFR 72-4). | 1-15-72 |  | 3-20-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Water lights, floating electric (CGFR 72-48)........... | 3-9-72 | 4-18-72 | 4-24-72 |  |  | 12-1-72 | 12-4-72 |
| Great lakes Maritime Academy, List as a Nautical School-Ship (CGD 72-92P). | 8-9-72 |  | 9-15-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Ship's Maneuvering Characteristics Data (CGD 72132PH) | 8-22-72 | 9-28-72 | 10-13-72 | $x$ |  |  |  |
| Unmar hed Barges; hull construction (CGD 72-130)... | 10-31-72 | 12-19-72 | 12-29-72 | $x$ | - + -- |  |  |
| Marine Engineering Systems and Components (CGD 72-2(6). | 11-17-72 | 12-12-72 | 12-20-72 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Remote Valve Controls (CGD 72-57)............ | 11-17-72 |  | 12-19-72 | $\times$ | ....---... |  |  |
| Update of Examination Requirements for Second and Third Mate (CGD 72-151) | 11-16-72 |  | 1-1-73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Towboat operator licensing (CGD $\mathrm{S}^{\text {2-132) }}$ ) .............. | 8-11-72 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9-13 ; 20 \\ 26, \& 27- \\ 72 \end{array}\right\|$ | 1-15-73 | $\times$ | ............. | : 3-2-73 | 9-1-73 |


|  | Surpeuppu pasodoid jo zopon | $\frac{\stackrel{c}{5}}{\frac{0}{2}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \text { 哥 } \\ & \text { y } \\ & \text { 岕 } \\ & \text { 苟 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction requirements for tank ships（CGD 72－245）． | Adv． Notice 1－26－73 |  | 3－15－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Great Lakes load lines（CGD 73－49）．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 3－23－73 |  | 4－15－73 |  |  |  |  |
| Wiring methods and materials for hazardous locations （CGD 73－6） | 2－14－73 |  | 3－16－73 |  |  |  |  |
| Oily ballast discharge requirements（CGD 72－179）．．．． | 2－15－73 |  | 3－19－73 |  |  |  |  |
| Emergency Position Indicating Radio Beacons（CGD 73－24）． | 3－5－73 | 4－18－73 | 4－30－73 | $\times$ |  |  |  |
| Firemen＇s outits on manned tank barges（CGD 73－11）．． | 4－26－73 | Or1 request | 5－28－73 | $x$ |  |  |  |

Note：This table which will be continued in future issues of the Proceedings is designed to provide the maritime public with better information on the status of changes to the Code of Federal Regulations made under authority granted the Cosst Guard．Only those proposals which have appeared in the Federal Register as Notices of Proposed Rulemaking，and as rules will be recorded．Proposed changes which have not been placed formally before the public will not be included．

## COAST GUARD BOATING SAFETY PUBLICATIONS

Except where otherwise noted，the below publications are available to the public by contact－ ing the boating safety division at your nearest Coast Guard district office．


The following publications are all available from the Director of Auxiliary in each Coast Guard District．

## TITLE OF PUBLICATION

Auxiliary No．
201 Saving Llves．This publication describes how membership in the Coast Guard Auxiliary offers boatmen the opportunity to ioin other skippers in further self－training，to participate in public service programs，and to enjoy the fellowship of boatmen with mutual interests．
 These courses include＂Boating Safety and Seamanship＂（12 lesson），＂Prineiples of Safe Sailing＂（ 7 lesson）and several short 1 lesson courses for the small boat operator．
204 Seal of Safety．The publication lists the equipment which your boat should have for safe outings on the water and describes how to seal of Safety．The publication ists the equipmentlesy Motorboat Examination program of the Caest Guard Auxiliary．
obtain a free equipment check through the Courtesy motorsoat Examination program of the the fishermen！This publication discusses the need for sportsmen to learn the elementary prineiples of small boat handling and Hunters，Fishermen！This publication discusses the ne
it outlines the subjects covered in the 2 －hour course．
206 First Aid for the Boatman．This brochure provides the boatman with information pertin

## THE PRESIDENT

## PROCLAMATION 4185

## National Safe Boating Week, 1973

By the President of the United States of America

## A Proclamation

As more and more Americans in all parts of our Nation turn to boating as a leisure time activity, we need to give increasing attention to the safety requirements of the millions who participate in this healthy, challenging outdoor sport.

Aware of this need, the Congress approved a joint resolution on June 4, 1958 (72 Stat. 179) requesting that the President proclaim an annual National Safe Boating week during the week including July 4th of each year.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RICHARD NIXON, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 1, 1973, as National Safe Boating Week.

I urge all Americans who use our waterways to take advantage of the numerous boating safety courses offered by governmental and private organizations to help make their stay afloat as safe as it is enjoyable. These courses, sponsored by the United States Coast Guard, the Coast Guard Auxiliary, the United States Power Squadrons, the American Red Cross and various State agencies, provide the average citizen with the information needed for the safe operation of recreational boats. I particularly urge the novice and the occasional boatman, the one who operates a small boat on only a few weekends of the year, to consider his own and his family's safety and to be prepared for the unexpected by taking advantage of the sound safety information such courses offer.

I also invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to provide for the observance of this week.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-ninth day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-seventh.




[^0]:    Lieufenanf (ig) A. W. Vander Meer, Jr., Edifor

[^1]:    ON MARCH 28, 1973, the U.S. Coast Guard published final regulations that classify Personal Flotation Devices (PFDs) into five categories, and

