Attendees via Teams: Jaimie Bever (Chair/BPC), Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC), Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP), Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC), Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO), Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC), Senator Joseph Williams (Tribal/Swinomish), Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish), Bettina Maki (Staff/BPC), Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG), Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA), Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley), and Rein Attemann (Environment Alternate/Washington Environmental Council).

Absent: Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC)

1. Welcome
   Chair Bever welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Approval of October 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes
   There were no changes recommended for the minutes. Chair Bever informed the group that the minutes would be provided to the Board as information for the February 18, 2021 meeting.

3. Updates Since Last Meeting
   Chair Bever reported that the OTSC’s Environment Alternate representative Blair Engelbrecht (Puget Soundkeeper) will be stepping down from her position on the committee due to scheduling changes. Jaimie welcomed Rein Attemann (Washington Environmental Council) who has stepped in as Blair’s replacement.

   Chair Bever reminded the group that the Board made the decision to continue with definition of oil previously adopted for the Interpretive Statement. The reason was the lack of a clear legislative directive, which was not provided in ESHB 1578, to deviate from Ecology’s definition. For now, even though the directive may occur further down the road, the definition of oil should be the same for both the Board and Ecology while working through the directives of ESHB 1578.

   Ecology will be hosting another Risk Model webinar on February 10, 2021 between 1300 and 1500.
This webinar will focus on the vessel encounter module of the Risk Model. Chair Bever will send the link to OTSC members. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) mentioned that San Juan County was conducting their own drift study and will be releasing their report soon.

Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish) acknowledged that Ecology had been sending a great deal of notifications inviting comments for updates to oil spill contingency plans. Swinomish were overwhelmed with providing comments in the short time originally given by Ecology. He wanted to alert everyone that Ecology extended the comment period. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) responded that there was a different distribution list for those types of updates and that if any OTSC members were interested, she could send links to sign up.

Chair Bever mentioned that the Board had finalized the 2021 meeting schedule. She will send the schedule to OTSC members when she sends the links to Ecology’s next webinar. She will also include the link to the other Ecology distribution lists mentioned above.

4. Updates on Synopsis of Changing Vessel Traffic Trends
Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) gave a presentation to the Board at the January 21, 2021 meeting regarding the status of the Synopsis of Changing Vessel Traffic Trends. The OTSC received the slides from that presentation for reference as she walked the committee through an overview of that presentation. The presentation slides are available on the Board’s website in the meeting materials found at https://pilotage.wa.gov/2021---2022.html.

Sara began with some background information regarding the synopsis. The main focus of the presentation to the Board was to look at the deliverables in the Scope of Work between the Board and Ecology and to talk about the methods being used, and more specifically the manual method, which is when Ecology reviews the Advanced Notice of Transfer (ANT) data and tries to match it up with AIS data for all vessels included in the synopsis.

Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) acknowledged the extensive work needed for the manual method. He then asked about utilization of anchorages for bunkering, adding that they didn’t seem to be looking at changes in transits between anchorages and whether or not they are bunkering. He wondered if there was a way to include transfer data to and from anchorages using the manual method. He also wondered if the tug and the relationship to the barge were known, as well as where and how much they transferred and where they were going, they would also know if it was being escorted. The only vessels missing from the database would be those transiting through the area from Alaska or Canada, where the transfer isn’t happening within WA waters.

Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) explained on how Ecology was sorting and displaying that information, walking the committee through the columns on the data spreadsheet, including to and from anchorage locations. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) wondered if that meant that they would only know anchorage use if there was a transfer. Sara responded yes and suggested that to get at the info Fred was looking for, Ecology would need to do a separate occupancy study,
like the trend synopsis. Fred then asked some additional questions for clarification regarding transits in Haro Strait and inbound/outbound laden vessels. Sara clarified that vessels in the area will not show up in the trend synopsis unless they are transiting in the study area.

Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) was also looking for clarification regarding the data collected. A lengthy conversation followed regarding what data was being captured and the different ways the data sheet could be sorted for specific information requests. Conversations included inbound/outbound transits, areas captured in the data, and laden/unladen assumptions.

A question arose of whether the Board should define a transit as laden only if the vessel is fully loaded, or if any load size should be considered a laden transit. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) replied that any time a tank vessel goes to a load port, it is going to be loaded, and that is what matters for practical operations, like escorting. Some vessels may be loading and some may be discharging. A group discussion followed regarding assumptions of laden/unladen. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) wondered if OTSC or Board should make the call. Chair Bever thought the OTSC could make the call to provide clarification. Sheri Tonn (Ex officio/BPC) agreed, adding that it might be little in the weeds for the Board. Sara will discuss it with her team and report back to the OTSC.

Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish) wondered if Senator Williams (Tribal/Swinomish) had any comments or questions. Senator Williams agreed with Fred Felleman that it shouldn’t be that difficult to get an accurate count of transits and felt it was important information. He also expressed support for changing the definition of laden per the conversations above. Tom Ehrlichman had some questions regarding vessels engaged in bunkering and the study coverage timeline. He made a request for the data spreadsheet that Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) presented during the meeting adding that the conversation was hard to follow while seeing only portions of the data on the screen. He requested that the spreadsheet be stamped draft and circulated to the OTSC. Sara warned that the document is revised constantly. She was hesitant to share it because of that. Chair Bever wondered if Ecology and Swinomish could meet separately to go through the document. Sheri Tonn (Ex officio/BPC) expressed concern about a draft being taken as something more concrete, adding that it seemed premature to share the data. A lengthy dialog followed regarding the distribution of the document as well as additional questions regarding the data.

Sheri Tonn concluded that it seemed to her that the purpose of the presentation was to review the method and that the next step would be for Ecology to actually work on a written description of the method, followed by a comparison between the written method and the data. She acknowledged that a lot of information had been provided to the committee at the meeting, but that it was intended to be more of an introduction. She was concerned that there was too much focus on the data than the methodological process of gathering the data. She wondered if another meeting was needed for the methodological process once Ecology has put it in writing. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) suggested a session at the OTSC to go through the same method presentation that Ecology presented to the Board. After additional group discussion, it was decided that Swinomish would work with Ecology to obtain the data spreadsheet and that Ecology would
offer the presentation at a separate OTSC meeting for those members who were interested.

5. **Discussion Regarding Data Collection**
Chair Bever reported that the original idea for this agenda item was to discuss the status of the data collection. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) has provided an update from Ecology’s standpoint. Regarding the BPC’s Tank Vessel Movement Form, it is still being submitted by Centerline and Vane Brothers. BPC has talked to Marine Exchange and determined that they are unable to obtain the necessary data to determine laden/unladen. A conversation about USCG data and software followed.

6. **Discussion Regarding BPC Risk Management**
The state has released a new Risk Management database. The BPC will assign risks to the committees related to the Board’s various programs. The OTSC will spend twenty minutes or so at each meeting discussing Risk Management and identifying risks to be reported by BPC to the state’s database for monitoring or resolution. Chair Bever warned that the discussion about risk can get very big very fast and that the committee was being asked to look at risks that were within the agency’s control. Oil Transportation Safety with respect to ESHB 1578 will be the risk focus. The Risk Model will address many of the possible risks and the committee can work through those when the time comes. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) asked for written instruction from the state definitions of risk and what the state was looking for exactly. She was concerned that the committee might conflate and confuse topics, making them bigger issues than they need to be. She also suggested that meeting materials make it very clear if a recommendation is being asked of the committee.

7. **Next Steps**
Chair Bever will poll the committee to see who is interested in a smaller meeting with Ecology to see the presentation as discussed earlier in the meeting. Regarding next full OTSC meeting, she suggested mid to late Spring.

The meeting concluded with a conversation regarding OTSC roles and responsibilities. Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish) suggested that they would be in favor of the committee meeting again sooner, after digesting the method. He acknowledged the scope for the trend synopsis was already approved but that he was interested in implementation. He also had questions regarding what the Board was asking of the OTSC regarding the Synopsis of Changing Vessel Traffic Trends. Chair Bever clarified that the Board did not ask the OTSC to help develop the scope for the synopsis. The Board was not asking the OTSC for recommendations or specific input. The idea was to put information in front of OTSC for members to bring information back to the communities they represent. Further down the road, the Board will likely ask the OTSC to help digest the information from the synopsis. Sheri Tonn (Ex officio/BPC) saw no problem with further review of the methodology but suggested that it would be hard to change at this point. However, thoughts on how to display the data will be helpful. Chair Bever added that questions regarding the scope should go straight to the Board, not the OTSC since the scope was not approved by the OTSC. The meeting was adjourned.