

Transcript

April 17, 2025

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 0:48

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

I think we're ready to call the open session back to order and we're going to continue the discussion we had last month with regard to RCW 88.16.180 oil tankers where a state licensed pilot could be required.

We have some excellent correspondence that's come to us from Canadian pilots, and we're gonna open with Jaimie kind of giving a little outline as to where we stand right now with regard to the Washington state legislature and the governor's office, and then we'll move on to discussion about next steps.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Really quick the correspondence that Sheri just mentioned will be posted to the public record on our website, from BC Coast pilots, for anybody who would like to read it.

So, the Governor's Office is working with the legislature to see if there is a temporary fix to address any liability concerns that the board may have and that would keep the current practice in place until it can be addressed through a public process, gearing up for the 2026 legislative session. And we will obviously know the direction of the legislature by the next meeting of the board, we've got 10 more days or so in session. And then the board will know at that point which direction to go for the motion at the May meeting.

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

But whatever happens, there will be a discussion at the May meeting and in theory we may take action of some sort at the May meeting, depending on what happens in the legislature.

And it's clear that moving forward, we definitely need a public process on this issue.

Particularly if the legislature directs us toward having a public process.

Are there comments from the board at this point? Any board members?

Hearing none from the board. Are there public comments at this point?

Lovel.

LP

Lovel Pratt 3:37

Yeah. Thank you. So. Not having seen this, does the letter that you received from the BC Coast pilots, did that inform the process that's currently potentially underway in the legislature?

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 3:57

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

No. We got this yesterday evening.

(Eleanor Kirtley in-person)

It seems to affirm...

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Yes. Yeah, I would say that.

LP

Lovel Pratt 4:10

OK. And you've posted it yet or you haven't posted it yet?

I mean, is it available now?

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 4:18

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

No, we just got it last night so we'll post it after the meeting.

LP

Lovel Pratt 4:21

OK.

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 4:22

(Eleanor Kirtley in-person)

Maybe read the short conclusion at the end.

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 4:30

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Lovel, I can read the short conclusion at the end of the letter if that would be helpful.

LP

Lovel Pratt 4:41

Yep. Would you?

I mean, if you could read it, that would be helpful. Thank you.

BJ

Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 4:46

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

It concludes with we are confident that the current model of Canadian pilotage needs water, is supported by robust tug escort requirements and extensive environmental protocols remains the most appropriate framework for ensuring navigational safety and minimizing environmental risk. That's the end.

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Is there other public comment?

Lovel.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 5:29

Thank you. You know, this is something that I've been wanting to ask.

That was that, I heard stated at the meeting on the 20th by a BC coast pilot, you know, and the statement that you just read, I would have fully agreed with that prior to the last meeting.

But there was a statement made then that was really concerning to me and I've been wanting to have an opportunity just to ask for more clarification.

And it was a statement about how.

I'm trying to find it in the.

The actual wording here in the in the transcript, but it was basically that the BC Coast pilots could ensure that tankers remained in Canadian waters by transiting outside of the vessel traffic lanes at turn point and.

And my question is.

I mean, I'm just really concerned about the safety of doing that.

And whether or not the vessel traffic service, which I realize is the Canadian Vessel Traffic Service and I don't know if representatives are here, who can speak to whether or not that would be allowed.

But it was just a really it was a concerning statement and I would love to get more information about that and understand the safety concerns surrounding that practice.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 7:04
(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Captain Spink.

JP **Jake Spink - President** 7:06

Yeah, I'll respond to that. 100% we never said we'd go outside the traffic lanes.

We could stay in Canadian waters for all traffic lanes and turn all recommendations 100%. And that was clearly stated as well.

There's no way that was ever said we're going outside the traffic lanes.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 7:29

So OK and I'm a lay person here and I've got the marine traffic app and I watch it on a regular basis. And when I watch the commercial ships transiting West and South at turn point, I always see them going through Washington state waters.

JP **Jake Spink - President** 7:52

Depending on traffic, we often if there's overtaking vessels, if there's three or four vessels inbound outbound there, we're 100% following the traffic separation scheme, traffic separation zones and temporal recommendations by staying in Canadian waters.

No if, ands or buts.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 8:14
(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Thank you.

Are there other comments questions?

So depending on whether there's legislative action in what that legislative action might be will influence what we do at the May meeting.

We'll make sure that people are aware of any legislative action that might take place.

And of course, we don't know when and if the governor might sign any bill that would come out of the legislature, but that would be necessary for this to be, for their action to be finalized.

And you know, kind of depending on what happens, we will work on our public process moving forward.

Does anybody else have anything they would like to add today?

Lovel will make it quick.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 9:21

Yeah. I just would like to follow up with perhaps John Robertson or a representative of the Puget Sound pilots.

I'm just interested to just get confirmation about the location of the vessel traffic, the separation lengths there at Turn point and whether they are in Canadian waters at that point.

JR **John Robertson (USCG)** 9:50

I can comment on that and also going to provide another update. I don't have it right in front of me, but yes, I believe that you can still maintain presence in Canadian waters while still being compliant with the traffic separation schemes.

This lends itself, now that being said, that's not necessarily ideal for the most efficient and effective throughput of traffic because again that can cause constraints on where vessels are or aren't going to be operating within those traffic lanes.

But that is definitely a potential. That's one of the other greater concerns I think with this topic in general for us. Is that this state statute is putting itself into a position where it is potentially coming in conflict with international agreements that would be more the purview of the federal government including the cooperative Vessel Traffic Service, as well as just the overarching aspect of the fact that we are talking about vessels that are bound for ports and places outside of the United States that a state government would potentially be trying to put requirements on.

I had spoken with Jamie you and I had spoken earlier. I just wanted to confirm for everyone also that our legal team up at District is looking into some of the parameters of that. And I know the last I heard from them, they are still planning on reaching out to the BPC's legal team.

So hopefully they should be hearing from district here sometime soon.

But I think that answers your question, unless I miss something.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 11:32

OK.

Thank you.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 11:36
(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Anything else?

OK.

Thank you.

We will move on to committee reports...

Is there any public comment?

Rishi.

RL **Rishi Luthra** 17:09

Thank you, chair.

I just wanted to request the group. It was a bit unclear regarding the RCW 88.16.180.

What are the next steps?

So just wanted to request you how do we go about it?

Will there be an appeal session?

Will people be allowed to submit?

You know clarifications once again.

So if you can throw some light on the next steps, that'll be great. Thanks.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 17:32
(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Thank you.

And we, should the legislature take any action, we'll be sure that that is clearly communicated. Right now, we just don't know where that stands and it is in the hands of the governor's office and the Washington state legislature.

But clearly by the May meeting, we should have some clear direction for you and there will definitely be an opportunity for public comment at the May meeting. It's a little bit of a moving target right now is the best way to put it.

Lovel.

RL **Rishi Luthra** 18:11

Thank you, chair.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 18:14

Yes, thank you for that. Thank you for that question about next steps.

I'm also very interested in that process and just following up on that I had received from a legislator what appears to be a reply from the Puget Sound Pilots to the Board of Pilotage Commissioners, and I just would request that that correspondence be added to the materials.

You know that were that are on that website you've got going.

As well as the transcript of this portion of the meeting today.

And then also I had received some chartlets.

That prompted my questions earlier and I just would like those also to be made available.

On the public document page that you've got going.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 19:08

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Lovel, we don't know what you're referring to with regard to a letter from PSP to BPC.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 19:16

Oh I can.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 19:16

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

We don't.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 19:17

I can forward that e-mail.

Yeah, it was from one of the legislators.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 19:22

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

We don't have that.

LP **Lovel Pratt** 19:22

Yep. **Ok.**

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 19:28

(Ivan Carlson in-person)

Lovel, are you referring to the chartlets which we provided to the BPC that captain Hannuksela provided to the BPC early on in this discussion?

Is that what you're thinking about?

LP **Lovel Pratt** 19:45

Yes. Yeah.

BJ **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** 19:49

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

There was the letter from the attorney.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

No this was when they were like drafts. It wasn't even an official correspondence.

It was just we were, after the meeting that we had with them and Matt put together some maps,

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Chartlets, but we're not aware of a letter Lovel.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Go ahead and forward it to us and we'll take a look, Lovel.



Lovel Pratt 20:18

Yeah, will do.



Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage) 20:20

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

For everybody for the next meeting, the cutoff date for comments is May 8th, so please be sure to have any letters that you want considered in writing to us by end of actually end of business May 7th because the 8th is the day that it goes out to the board members.

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Well, and there's also the possibility for something to get to the board after that.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

There is. But if you want, you know, thoughtful consideration just to be aware of the limited time the board members have.

We'd like to try to get stuff to them a week ahead of meetings.

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

So, if there is legislation that passes out of both houses. Should we make sure that that legislation is distributed, even though it will not have the governor's signature? More than likely at that point?

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Distributed to the key stakeholders?

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Yeah, the key stakeholders.

OK. So we will distribute any legislation to key stakeholders, to our stakeholder list and post it to our website. But like I say, it wouldn't by May 8th it's highly unlikely it would be signed by the governor by then. Could be but depends on when the legislature takes action if they do.

Yes?

(Scott Brewen in-person)

So what is the current status? Because I'm not sure that I'm clear right now.

Are we still operating under the motion from the previous meeting that was approved?

Are we still sending something to the agents to tell them that things have changed until we hear back from the legislature?

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Yeah, and that's the letter that's in your hands right now.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

Well, but that's specific to Washington ports correct?

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Correct. That's correct, right, right.

(Jaimie Bever in-person)

I just wanna make that that has nothing to do with the legislation.

(Sheri Tonn in-person)

Yeah, that's true. That has nothing to do with legislation.

The motion that was passed at the last meeting doesn't affect what the legislature is currently potentially discussing with regard to ships coming strictly to and from Canada, not going to US ports or places.

Is there any other public comment?

OK. Hearing none, our next meeting is Thursday, May 15th.

● **Bever, Jaimie (WSF-Pilotage)** stopped transcription