



STATE OF WASHINGTON
BOARD OF PILOTAGE COMMISSIONERS

2901 Third Avenue, Suite 500 | Seattle, Washington 98121 | (206) 515-3904 | www.pilotage.wa.gov

Meeting Minutes – Oil Transportation Safety Committee (OTSC)

April 6, 2020, 1:00pm – 4:00pm

Conference Call/Skype

Attendees via Skype: Jaimie Bever (Chair/BPC), Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC), Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP), Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC), Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO), JD Leahy (Ecology Alternate), Brian Kirk (Ecology Alternate), Bettina Maki (Staff/BPC)

Attendees via Phone: Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC), Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA), Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth), Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley), Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper), Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC), Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG), Rein Attemann (Public/WEC); Keith Kridler (Pilot Alternate/PSP)

Welcome

Chair Bever welcomed everyone to the meeting and laid out the plans for the conference call/Skype format, which was similar to the last meeting.

She informed the OTSC that as of April 1, 2020 Dale Jensen is the Ecology representative on the Board, and therefore on the OTSC roster. Sara Thompson and JD Leahy will remain Ecology/BPC Alternates. Rein Attemann (Public/WEC) inquired if the switch was within the framework membership as outlined in the committee roster. Chair Bever explained Sara's role as the Ecology liaison for the oil transportation efforts and that Sara remains a member on other Board committees, while Dale Jensen will focus on general Board topics.

Review and Approval of March 17, 2020 Meeting Minutes

The OTSC received a draft of the March 17, 2020 meeting minutes prior to the meeting. Chair Bever pointed out that Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) had previously brought attention to a couple of items. Each OTSC member then had an opportunity to respond to the minutes. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) had no comments; Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) had no comments; Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) had no additional comments; Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) had no comments; Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) had no additional comments; Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) had a question regarding next steps for the oil definition and why it included a reference to LPG if it is not oil.

He requested parentheses or brackets around the words see below in the oil discussion to refer to the laden/unladen (in ballast) section for clarity of the conversation. He also wanted northern Bellingham Bay to be included in the discussion regarding the definition of Connected Waterways East. Finally he wanted to clarify that he is the environmental representative appointed by the environmental community for this committee and requested that the minutes be revised to make that clear, as opposed to stating that his views were in line with the environmental community. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) had no additional comments; Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) had no comments; Laird Hail (Advisor/USCS) had no comments; Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) had no questions or comments, noting that she had missed the prior meeting.

Chair Bever will make the requested changes and finalize the minutes, making them available to the public and providing them to the Board for the May meeting as a part of the OTSC update.

1. Remaining Definitions

Prior to the meeting, Chair Bever provided OTSC members with draft redline and clean versions of the Interpretive Statement document, which included updates to the definitions discussed at the last meeting and new proposed interpretations for review.

“Under the Escort of a Tug or Tugs”

Chair Bever shared that her understanding based on the last meeting was that the proposed definition had OTSC consensus, with the addition of references to the CFR and Puget Sound Harbor Safety Plan as sources for the definition. The only other change was the addition of the term “proximity to hazards” as recommended by Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP). He offered that proximity to hazards is what escorting is all about and felt that it was appropriate to add it. Chair Bever asked the committee members if there were concerns with that addition. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) pointed out that proximity to shore was clearly top priority, but that maneuverability of the vessel were parameters that should be considered, clarifying that proximity should not be the only consideration. Chair Bever reminded him that the language includes several considerations, as written in the Puget Sound Harbor Safety Plan and that the proximity language would be added in addition to the other considerations. There were no other comments.

Chair Bever went around the table to all OTSC members, alternates and advisors present one more time for consensus regarding the definition as discussed. Full consensus was reached and the definition as declared final.

“Rosario Strait”

The group reviewed revised northern boundaries proposed by Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) based on feedback at the last meeting. He explained that he revised the northern boundary to match up with the USGS definition. The southern boundary was the same as before. He then put the definition into words, similar to the same format the USGS used. Chair Bever then asked for committee feedback. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) informed the committee that he had discussed the proposed boundaries with his members and the general response was that they will

follow the pilot's recommendation. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) had no objections. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) liked the definition and the graphic accompanying it, and recommended that the graphic be included in the Interpretive Statement. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) ask for clarification that the southern boundary was depicted as it was originally proposed and that the only thing that changed was the northern boundary to reflect the USGS definition, which was confirmed. He questioned to what degree the OTSC wanted to use existing definitions and whether they should reference the USGS definition at the northern boundary. Chair Bever asked the members for their thoughts on that recommendation considering that other sources were being referenced. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) answered that it made sense to her. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) wondered what value it would add. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) answered that it would add rationale. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) asked, hypothetically, what if the USGS changed their definition. Would the Board then have to track it and go back and revise their Interpretive Statement? Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) added that the description *as is* made it clear what was being said. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Escort/AWO) agreed with Jason adding that the evidence in this case is the actual definition being described, which removes the confusion if the USGS decided to change anything. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) responded that only the southern boundary written definition provided the latitude/longitude characteristics. He added that it made sense to include the written description, the latitude/longitude, and the reference to the USGS in the definition, suggesting that the USGS likely wouldn't change the definition and that the reference would provide rationale and be consistent with other definitions in the Interpretive Statement. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) agreed it was a good argument. However, he suggested it was just a simple geographic description and that adding a reference wouldn't add anything. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) said she didn't feel strongly either way, but if the committee decided to include the reference she recommended a footnote noting that the committee was inspired by the USGS definition. Chair Bever reminded the committee that they weren't including a reference or a footnote for the southern definition and wondered if there should be uniformity within the definition. The committee continued to discuss whether or not to include a reference for the northern boundary. Going back to each member, Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) said he was good with the definition for the purposes of ESHB 1578. Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) suggested that it would create confusion and that it needed to be clear that the definition was different from the CFR Special Area definition. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) suggested that because the CFR and the Board's ultimate definition would provide for different aspects of operations, he didn't believe there would be confusion on the practical side. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) pointed Laird Hail to the opening of the Interpretive Statement, which specifies that the definitions were specific to interpretation of terms as they relate to ESHB 1578. He wondered if that language helps to keep the CFR separate from the Interpretive Statement definitions. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) mentioned that he agreed with Laird and that adding a note that said this was not the CFR definition for clarity made sense. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) agreed. Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) said that would be sufficient. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) suggested

language at the top of the document with a disclaimer for all the definitions, that an attempt was made to look for public referenced definitions. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) thought that was a good idea to help frame how the definitions came about and why there are references to sources in some definitions and not in others. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) agreed, pointing out that in the future, there will need to be some documentation of where the definitions came from. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) then pointed out that the current discussions further addressed his request to reference the USGS for the northern boundary of Rosario Strait, and that for consistency sake, include the latitude/longitude. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) agreed with Sara Thompson's earlier suggestion to include a visual, that together the visual and text description would be sufficient. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) stated that the reason there was latitude/longitude in the southern description was because two of the points are not geographical points; one is in the water, and the middle and eastern points don't have already named geographic locations. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) suggested wordsmithing the southern boundary description. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) said he understood the reason for the inconsistency in latitude/longitude in the two descriptions. He still proposed including the reference to USGS on the northern description and didn't understand the resistance to the suggestion. Chair Bever checked in with the alternates. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) agreed that the committee should use as much specificity as possible, not just for clarity, but to protect against future challenges. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) was fine with the way it was written.

Chair Bever acknowledged the OTSC had consensus regarding the actual description/boundary. She offered to bring another draft of the language regarding a potential reference to the USGS to the committee for the next meeting, and then moved on to the next definition.

“Connected Waterways East”

The group reviewed the proposed definition and visual put forth by Blair Bouma based on the previous meeting. He reiterated that the committee agreed at the last meeting that the definition included all waters east of Rosario Strait, including northern Bellingham Bay. He tried to encapsulate the definition as succinctly as possible in words and visually. Chair Bever went around the room to get feedback. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) thought it made sense and that there is a more inclusive nature to what was being proposed, which he was comfortable with. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) had no objections. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) liked the language. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) thought it looked good. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) asked if the term “navigable waters” should be used and asked about Deception Pass. If the southern boundary of Rosario Strait is extended down to Fidalgo Island, then Deception Pass would be included in Connected Waterways East. He suggested a southern latitude or language to exclude Deception Pass. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) agreed and will make the change for the next draft. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) thought the language was fine. Chair Bever checked with alternates and advisors for input. Laird Hail

(Advisor/USCG) requested similar language as Rosario Strait, that the definition was different from the CFR definition. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) asked Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) for his opinion regarding the term navigable waters and whether it should be included. Laird didn't see the need for the additional language.

Chair Bever declared the definition complete with the addition of either a southern latitude or language exempting Deception Pass, and a note regarding the CFR definition.

“Oil”

The committee reviewed the RCW oil definition currently used by Ecology. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) did not suggest alternate language because it references existing authoritative language and he believes it is fine as is. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) mentioned that he did not check the substances listed on the referenced table in the definition. Other than that, he thought the definition made sense. Regarding the table, Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) mentioned that it includes numerous chemicals that are excluded from the definition. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) was fine with the definition. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) liked the definition. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) is fine with the language and added that it does not include LNG or LPG products. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) thought it made sense. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) suggested checking what the exclusions were before agreeing to this proposed language. He suggested the language in Ecology's definition "not limited to" was not a strong definition. He mentioned that dilbit is currently moving through Rosario Strait and he was not comfortable with language that did not include the very substances that are traveling through the waterways. For consistency sake, he didn't understand how the LPG question comes into play when talking about in ballast when it is not included in the definition of oil. Chair Bever asked Sara Thompson how Ecology handles the questions about what's included in the oil definition. She said that Ecology has no authority connected to LNG and LPG. Brian Kirk (Ecology Alternate/BPC) agreed. Regarding the different combinations of crude oil and diluents, Ecology includes all those in the existing definition of oil. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) suggested that they state it. Sara said it would be accurate to state, but not to quote is as the RCW. Fred suggested that within synthetic crude, they could bracket e.g. dilbit, with example added. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) warned that there are synthetics that are not dilbit crude and that perhaps another sentence could be added to the bottom stating the Board considers dilbit to be included in this definition. Chair Bever asked if there were any concerns with that approach. Hearing none, she checked with the alternates. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) wanted to know where the group stood with LNG. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) suggested that whether or not LPG and LNG were included depended on whether or not they were liquid at 25 degrees Celsius. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) thought it was straight forward that oil tankers can't carry LNG/LPG and LNG/LPG tankers can't carry oil, therefore including LNG/LPG was beyond the scope of committee work. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) agreed that the bill does not refer to gas carriers and

the they don't fit in the definition of oil. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) then pointed out that LNG/LPG are listed in the definition of "laden/unladen (in ballast)". Chair Bever said that the reason that language regarding was present in the definition was because the OTSC started off using the Board's definition of "in ballast", which includes LNG/LPG language. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) said that he would be fine if the OTSC definition didn't mention.

Chair Bever will provide a final version of the definition without the LNG language for approval at the next meeting.

"Laden/Unladen (In Ballast)"

For clarity sake, Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) suggested combining the terms laden, unladen, and in-ballast into one definition, as listed above. He doesn't believe that combining them loses anything. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) thought combining the definitions was a good move. Regarding the definitions, he preferred to listen to what others had to say before stating his opinion. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) had nothing additional to add, but was curious to hear the discussion. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) had nothing specific to add. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) liked that the proposed definition was inspired by the previous definition but was also interested in the discussing pertaining to the 3,000-barrel threshold. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) thought it made sense but pointed out a typo. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) appreciated Blair Bouma's desire to keep the second paragraph regarding LPG in the definition, however for consistency sake, the terms being defined were only pertaining to ESHB 1578. If LPG is not oil, then why would it be included. Chair Bever pointed out that the Interpretative Statement does not need to take the place of the Board's existing policies. The terms are specific to the bill and the other policy can stay in place. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) thought that someone was going to provide information regarding the 0.5% carrying capacity of a 40,000 DWT vessel. He was interested in seeing that number. A total of 1,700 barrels was suggested. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) pointed out that the language says 0.5% or 3,000 barrels, whichever is less. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) suggested adding the language "whichever is less" following the word 3,000 for clarity. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) provided an explanation of physical tankering to assist the conversation. He started by saying that he believed it was a very standard threshold in other regions. He added that if you picture a tank inside a ship, you can picture the bottom of the tank, which could be 30FT below sea level. Imagine that there is 6 inches or a foot of oil product in the bottom. If there was an incident and there was a puncture not just in the double hull, but in the cargo block, what happens is that because the oil is below sea level, the water rushes in and the oil floats on top and rises to the top of the tank with the sea level outside the tank. In the most common problem of grounding or something like that, the oil isn't going to come out, the water is going to come in. Now, if the ship was full, and the oil level was above sea level, that is a different situation. That's why the percentage makes sense, because

it's such a small amount of liquid in the bottom of the tank. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) wondered if it was impossible to get the remaining clingage out of the tank. Mark Homeyer (Tug Industry Alternate/Crowley) responded yes, that 0.5% was in response to what industry is unable to remove from the tank. Fred responded that he just wanted to understand, and that he was fine with it. Chair Bever asked if the committee had decided to take out the second paragraph referring to LPG knowing that the Board can keep its policy separate from the Interpretive Statement. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) thought it made sense to have one definition, but that it was the Board's decision. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) thought that because this definition was for 1578, he suggested that they be kept separate. He also added that he was okay with the definition as per the discussion. Additional discussion regarding the upper limit of 3,000 barrels followed. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) suggested that the committee move on. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) pointed out that ESHB 1578 refers to vessels up to 125,000 DWT. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) suggested revising the title to reflect only the specific section of the bill that the Board is interpreting.

Chair Bever concluded this discussion by stating that the committee could consider revising the title of the document and provide the revision to the committee for the next meeting.

“A Vessel Providing Bunkering or Refueling Services”

Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) explained his proposed definition, which was a middle ground to start the discussion. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) reiterated that she received feedback from Ecology individuals who were part of the legislative discussions who reported that bunker barges were excluded from tug escorts while in transit. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) said he added the 15 nautical mile radius with the understanding that if the vessel is taking the fuel from a source directly to the customer, that would be an example of a voyage intending to be exempt. However, in some cases that can be a long trip and didn't seem to be in the spirit of intention to include all the way across the region if the vessels were in route from the refineries to make a delivery. He then gave examples of the transits that would fall within 15 nautical miles and outside 15 nautical miles. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) appreciated Blair's efforts, but that the suggested language is still trying to interpret legislative intent when the legislature specifically excluded the bunkering function. Charlie Costanzo (Tug Industry/AWO) agreed with Bob, seeing it as a noble attempt to find a compromise but still beyond the text in the legislation. The goal of the group is to have fidelity toward the legislation and the proposed language goes beyond that. He said he has had extensive conversations about certain transits and when they move around bunkering fuel. The movements happen in a ways that counterintuitive. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) was interested in Fred Felleman's opinion. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) said she had trouble with the language proposed by Blair Bouma and offered that she would prefer the original version. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) wanted to talk about how vessels would use the exemption. He said he miscalculated how many additional escorts there would be and would like

to know what the actual numbers are. He mentioned that legislative intent was zero oil spills. He urged for a conversation with legislators for their intent. He mentioned that he tried to check in with tribal representatives to see if they felt this could be a significant source of waterway congestion, but did not receive a response. Chair Bever added that tribes had not responded to Board outreach. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) felt legislators were not given the information they needed to make proper decisions. In conclusion, he wants to know what the tribes have to say and what the legislators have to say.

At this point Chair Bever asked if Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) had any feedback since she was not part of the discussion at the last meeting. She reviewed Ecology's ESHB 1578 Focus Sheet stating that it did not specifically say that the goal was zero oil spills. The goal of the act was to make incremental improvements to the transportation of oil. Unfortunately, Eleanor lost connection to the meeting at that point. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) wondered why zero spills shouldn't be the goal. Bob Poole (Oil Industry/WSPA) responded that he kept going back to the language in the legislation that excluded bunkering, and at the end of the day everyone is trying to interpret something that was specifically excluded. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) added that she was reading the legislation, couldn't find the term incremental anywhere, and that the overall goal of the language was to prevent oil spills. Jason Hamilton (Other/BPC) mentioned to everyone that the Board's mission was 3-part: safety, environmental protection, and facilitating commerce. He pointed out the legislation doesn't say zero spills and excludes bunkering services. The interpretation, he suggested, lies somewhere in those points. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) explained that there were two ends to the spectrum. One is strictly the act of transferring oil from the bunker barge to the vessel and the other is bunker barges traveling independently from wherever they start to Rosario Strait and then through it to their destination. She liked where Fred Felleman was going, which was what is the actual magnitude of the barges that are truly moving, carrying bunker fuel to a vessel. That number strikes her as relatively low in this segment that is being discussed. She then asked if anyone could dispute that. There were no disputes. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) also mentioned his frustration with not having the deadweight tonnages of the vessels transiting through Rosario Strait. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) offered that in her recollection of conversations with the legislature, the size of the bunker barges was de minimis compared to the sizes of other ATBS and towed barges, however she's now hearing that the sizes of the barges is not de minimis. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) responded that it was because of lack of information from Ecology. He referenced the information that Ecology has now provided, which is missing deadweight tonnage for the most frequent vessels. Chair Bever reminded everyone that they were struggling to find the tonnage information. Not every vessel was listed in Lloyds Registry. Brian Kirk suggested that the exact deadweight tonnage could be provided by the vessel owners and operators directly. Chair Bever asked industry members on the call if they would be willing to help gather the missing data. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) clarified that the info isn't as critical for tonnages under 5,000. Charlie Costanzo (Tug

Industry/AWO) responded that this was a threshold issue for the legislature when they were making the law. It was not something he was willing to run around and pick up after the fact. He is disinclined to chase down the information because the legislation very clearly exempts bunkering services. Blair Englebrecht (Environment Alternate/Puget Soundkeeper) read the legislation aloud. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) pointed out that the Board may need to know the deadweight tonnage anyway to understand who it applies to. A discussion regarding the difference between statute implementation and rulemaking followed. Rein Attemann offered that in the legislation, to him the term providing is the act of doing something. He thought the language was made to make a clear distinction from ATBs and tankers that are under the escort of a tug or tugs carrying oil to somewhere for whatever purpose, i.e. in transit. He thinks the committee should focus on the word "providing". Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) said that Rein reiterated his original point. He then pointed out that there is expertise at the table who were not willing to provide the information that is needed. Clearly, the legislature folded this into the legislation regarding southern resident killer whales with knowledge that this geographic area is very important to the whales. He added that ATB and oil barge traffic has increased from 2014-2018. Sheri Tonn (Ex-officio/BPC) suggested that the various parties offer some language that could be debated and discussed at the next meeting. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) asked for data between now and then. Chair Bever stopped the conversation at this point realizing that consensus was not going to be reached at this time.

2. Identification of Geographic Zones

Chair Bever suggested, based on the discussion at the last meeting, to look at the 2015 VTRA zones, as requested by Fred Felleman. A visual of those zones was provided to the group. She suggested using the VTRA visual to discuss the remaining waterways further south. She then asked Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth), who had requested the VTRA zones, for his input. He suggested that the rationale for the identified zones should have more than proximity. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) confirmed that they were several factors he considered including speed, depth, etc. Fred Felleman (Environment/Friends of the Earth) suggested that Haro Strait and Boundary Pass could be broken up, as well as areas around turn point and east point. He suggested in order to talk about mitigation efforts, you have to talk about navigational and exposure challenges of the waterways, which vary. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) thought they were great points and good examples. There are zones within zones. Eleanor Kirtley (Marine Environment/BPC) suggested that "zone" was a very abstract term and that the committee could define it with as great of fidelity as the committee likes, or otherwise and that the committee is not limited to the VTRA zones. Blair Bouma (Pilot/PSP) added that while the VTRA zones are informative, the scope and scale are not close to what the OTSC needs to do for this undertaking. Before the next meeting, he will go over the whole district and provide a starting point for discussion. He will also develop a more detailed interpretation of "zones". Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) pointed at that Boundary Pass, Haro Strait, and turn point all have a nexus with Canadian waters as well that needs to be considered. Sara Thompson (Ecology Alternate/BPC) said Ecology could run the model through any waterways but that we would be regulating our own waters

when we get to rulemaking. Chair Bever reminded everyone that the zone identification was strictly to inform the model, not for any operational regulation. Laird Hail (Advisor/USCG) again suggested coordination with Canada because of regulations our rules are very different from Canada's. You could end up with unintended consequences. If it's too difficult to transit on the U.S. side, vessels may move over to the Canadian side of those waterways. Chair Bever suggested that members provide specific waterways that are of greatest concern for their communities for consideration in the zone discussions, before the next meeting if possible. She then suggested the conversation continue at the next meeting.

Brian Kirk encouraged everyone to remember that the purpose of the zones is to inform the analysis over the next 3 years. For the Committee, it's a balancing act of trying to do enough thinking for what makes sense for the zones without feeling obligated to conduct the analysis in that process. From his perspective, Ecology is looking for zones that make operational sense, and everyone will have the opportunity to participate in and contribute their perspectives and knowledge to the analysis. Then, once the analysis is done, the analysis just informs the rulemaking process, which is another opportunity for consultation and input. Ecology's intent is provide as much detail as possible during the process and that it's very likely that the results of the analysis is that they will see areas of differences within the identified zones and then they can decide through rulemaking how to treat those differences.

3. Tug Escort Technical Work Group

Chair Bever mentioned that the Board is looking into simulation exercises regarding tug capability. Blair Bouma (Pilot/BPC) informed the group that he will be working with a group of subject matter experts, separate from the OTSC, to look at the some of the practical concerns that could come up when the tug escort regulation in Rosario Strait takes effect in September. While it will not inform the current work of the OTSC, it will be a benefit to the Puget Sound Harbor Safety Plan. In addition, findings or information will come to the OTSC on an FYI basis.

4. Next Steps

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 21, 2020 at 1:00pm. The goal will be to wrap up the definitions and take a closer look at the zones.