Meeting Minutes – Oil Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC)
June 3, 10:00am – 12:00pm

Attendees via Teams: Jaimie Bever (Chair/BPC), Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC), Brian Kirk (Ecology Alternate/BPC), Lori Crews (Ecology Guest), Alex Hess (Ecology Guest), Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP), Keith Kridler (Pilot Alternate/PSP), 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), Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth), and Rein Attemann (Environment Alternate/Washington Environmental Council).
Absent: Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC)

1. Welcome
Chair Bever welcomed everyone to the meeting and briefly reviewed the agenda. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) then introduced Lori Crews and Alex Hess from Ecology. Lori is working on the data synthesis, compilation, and format of the Synopsis of Changing Vessel Traffic Trends. Alex has recently joined Ecology as a Project Manager in the Spills Program.

2. Approve February 1, 2021, Meeting Minutes
The group approved the February 1, 2021, OTSC meeting minutes as drafted.

Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) presented information regarding the development and collection of data for the Synopsis of Changing Vessel Traffic Trends. The presentation included a background of ESHB 1578, deliverables, methods, crossing line locations, timeline of deliverables, preliminary manual method results, overview of the synopsis report structure, and next steps. At the conclusion of the presentation, Sara asked for questions and whether there were any data trends that OTSC members were aware of that Ecology may have not taken into consideration.
Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) asked for clarification on the dates of the data presented. Sara responded that year one was from September 2019 to September 2020 and year two was September 2020 to September 2021.

Rein Attemann (Environment Alternate/Washington Environmental Council) asked why “laden” and “unknown” were grouped together in the charts. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) responded that because the requirement for the escort is laden, Ecology wanted to cast a wide net for what would be included in that category. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) mentioned that he was concerned how much adding “unknown” and “known” to the laden question would change the results. Lori Crews (Ecology Alternate/BPC) responded that most of the barges are not taking or discharging a full load. The number of vessels Ecology could report with 100% accuracy as to whether they were laden or unladen was small. Taking out the unknowns would result in a much smaller sample size. Fred acknowledged the challenge of vessels coming other locations such as Alaska and B.C. but also suggested that making assumptions about how much the vessels were carrying could follow common-known trends. He wondered if those would be considered “likely” or just “unknown”. Lori responded that there was line added, based on her professional opinion as a mariner, whether a vessel was likely laden or unladen. Sara acknowledged that the data she presented did not include Lori’s professional opinion regarding the “unknown” or “likely” designation. She suggested that the Board could make a determination about whether to include that line item of data. Lori reminded everyone that the conversation was strictly regarding barges, not tankers. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) added that Crowley rarely brings anything back from Canada. And when going to Oregon, they don’t always deliver cargo to Portland. He wanted to make sure that historical trends weren’t necessarily a reflection of current trends.

Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) inquired about absolute numbers. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) asked if he had a specific vessel type in mind for breaking out the numbers between laden and unknown. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry/Crowley) offered that Crowley, and likely Kirby, ATBs were running mostly full or mostly empty. Bunker barges would likely be the vessel type running between laden and unladen. However, bunker barges engaged in bunkering are exempt and therefore are removed from the data set when they are engaged in bunkering. Sara said Ecology would run some additional charts for the OTSC to review.

Brian Kirk (Ecology Alternate/BPC) reiterated that Ecology was willing to provide some visuals to break out the categories for discussions. However, he was cautious about making any changes to their methodology. Lori Crews (Ecology Alternate/BPC) also cautioned that COVID-19 played a role in the trends that will be included in the synopsis. Brian agreed adding that Ecology may not be able to answer the legislative question of whether the new statute for tug escorts had a significant impact on routes. The data collected will be shared and may show that there was not a huge shift, or stampede, from Rosario to Haro.
4. Risk Management
Chair Bever began the conversation with some clarifications regarding enterprise risk management. The process is to state the goal, identify the risk, evaluate the risk, prioritize the risk, monitor and review the results, and then to communicate those results. Identified risks will be entered into a state database and updated and mitigated as needed. The process is ongoing and will be discussed at committee meetings. The BPC is responsible for the risks. The committee provides feedback and will focus on goals and associated risks. The rest of the process will happen at the agency level. Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) referred to an email comment from Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish) that enterprise risk management was for programmatic risks, not for navigational risks. Tom Ehrlichman thanked Laird for referencing his email, and further clarified that the BPC, as a state agency, was looking at its own performance, not Ecology’s endeavors.

a. Tug Escort Risk Memo
Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) introduced the Tug Escort Risk Memo and provided some background on its development. Guidance regarding tug escorts was recommended as the September 1, 2020, mandate in Rosario Strait and connected waterways east was drawing near. WSPA was approached to take on a project, along with other maritime professionals, to help inform safe tug escorting. The effort resulted in the memorandum, which as provided to the committee. The technical components included Delphi Maritime collaborating with tug escort professionals.

Chair Bever thanked Bob and reminded everyone that the memo was a good example of navigational risk management to be considered as a part of future rulemaking, not programmatic risk management, which would be talked about next on the meeting agenda. Brian Kirk (Ecology Alternate/BPC) acknowledged the work done on the memo and the efforts of Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) for bringing attention to the matter. He also acknowledged WSPA and AWO, as well as the tug operators themselves. He added that Ecology will be focusing more on this topic as they move into the tug escort analysis project.

Jason Hamilton (Public/BPC) suggested that the memo should include a reference to VTS as a risk mitigation factor. Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) agreed. JD Leahy (Ecology Alternate/BPC) asked for clarification regarding the term on the bottom of page 2 “bracketing response time”. Captain Jeff Slesinger, Delphi Marine and author of the report, joined the meeting briefly to respond to the inquiry. He said it was the interval between an event and applied course correction.

Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) wanted to make sure it was noted that he had not given any feedback during the meeting because he hadn’t had a chance to review the memo yet. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) responded that there was no time sensitivity to the document. It had been circulated to the USCG and the Puget Sound Harbor Safety Committee as initial information to inform future decisions.
b. **Brainstorm Session**

The committee spent some time identifying goals based on ESHB 1578 deliverables and the risks attached to those goals for further consideration by the BPC and inclusion in their enterprise risk management database. These brainstorming sessions are ongoing and will continue at each meeting. Chair Bever thanked the committee for their input and time regarding this important topic.

5. **Next Steps**

a. **Action Items**

Ecology will work on new charts based on the previous conversation. Chair Bever will send those to the OTSC. Any other comments/question regarding the memo can go to Chair Bever or Ecology. The memo can also be considered for a future meeting agenda item.

b. **Next Meeting**

Another brainstorm session will be included on the agenda to review the rest of the ESHB 1578 deliverables.

Chair Bever asked if members had any other topics they’d like to see on the next agenda. Tom Ehrlichman (Tribal/Swinomish) wondered if a discussion regarding the extensive use of anchorages could be a future topic for the OTSC. He also suggested that Tribes would be interested in providing a short briefing on the Treaty Fishing Rights as they relate to vessel traffic and their effect on the usual and accustomed fishing grounds. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) was in favor of these suggestions. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) informed the group that Ecology will be scheduling risk model presentations for the OTSC in the near future.

Chair Bever suggested late summer for the next OTSC meeting. BPC staff will send a Doodle Poll.

Meeting adjourned at 1200.