

## **NASBLA Engineering, Reporting & Analysis Committee Meeting Summary<sup>1</sup> Friday, March 6, 2009, Double Tree Guest Suites, Lexington, KY**

The NASBLA Engineering, Reporting & Analysis Committee (ERAC)—chaired by **Toby Velasquez**, BLA, New Mexico—met from 8:15 a.m–4:45 p.m., March 6, 2009, in Lexington, Ky. Twenty-six (26) BLAs, State Staff, NASBLA Associates, USCG personnel, and NASBLA staff attended.<sup>2</sup>

### **AGENDA<sup>3</sup>**

The day was divided into general discussion and report-out sessions with the full Committee and product discussions within individual charge teams. The full Committee portion included introductory and closing remarks by NASBLA Board President **Richard Moore**, BLA Florida, and ERAC Chair **Toby Velasquez**; reviews of progress, issues, obstacles and next steps associated with each of five FY09 Committee charges<sup>4</sup> by charge team leaders **Ken Ripley** (Tennessee), **Dave Harris** (BLA Utah), **Tammy Terry** (Ohio), **Kim Jackson** (Idaho), and **Deborah Gona** (Committee staff); and reports on recent activities of external task forces and committees relevant to ERAC's work [NBSAC Accident Reporting (Regulatory Review) Task Force report by **Fred Messmann** (Task Force Chair, BLA Nevada) and **Ken Ripley**; UL / PFD Working Groups report by **Paul Donheffner** (BLA Oregon); ABYC Product Interface Committee recap by **Dick Snyder** (ret., Mercury Marine)].

### **PRODUCT PROGRESS and MONITORING REPORT PRESENTATIONS<sup>5</sup>**

The PowerPoint presentations delivered by charge teams 1, 3, and 4, and the recommendations delivered by charge team 5 are included in the combined document **ERAC Team 1\_3\_4 PPTs Team 5\_recom 030609.pdf**, at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/2686267/files>. Content from the report presented on behalf of charge team 2 is folded into the recap of the team product discussion outcomes in this Summary.

The full monitoring reports are available in a combined document, **ERAC Monitoring Reports\_030609.pdf**, at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/2686267/files>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not intended as verbatim proceedings, but a summary of main events, critical discussion points and action items.

<sup>2</sup> Attendance list is in on page 5 of this Summary.

<sup>3</sup> Full agenda is on page 6 of this Summary.

<sup>4</sup> The Committee charter, membership rosters and five charges are included in the Appendix to this Summary.

<sup>5</sup> PDF files also are available by contacting Deborah Gona, ERAC staff liaison, at [deb@nasbla.org](mailto:deb@nasbla.org).

## **CHARGE TEAM PRODUCT DISCUSSION OUTCOMES**

When the full Committee reconvened late in the afternoon following individual charge team breakout sessions, Chair **Toby Velasquez** reviewed with attendees the FY09 process of creating and evaluating the work products of the Committee; he reminded that the evaluation would take place first at the team level and then at the Committee level before presentation to the NASBLA Executive Board for its review. Since June 28, 2009 is the deadline for products to be delivered to the Board, Toby proposed that the teams have work products set during the May 1-15 timeframe to allow time for the drafting and review process and in anticipation of a May product progress report to the Board.

Following are the outcomes of the charge teams' discussions. No objections were raised on the recommendations for activities/work products, and all were directed to proceed.

### **Charge One (Team leader ~ Ken Ripley)**

- As an outcome of its compilation and review of the past 10 years' worth of fatal accident reports in the team members' states and knowledge of on-going discussions concerning the need to improve Boating Accident Reporting Database (BARD) data, the team recommended development of guidance in the form of a revised list of boat accident cause (contributing factor) and accident type definitions for inclusion in the NASBLA Comprehensive Class manual reference materials (located in the back of each student manual), in the BARD Web Online Help-Data Dictionary, and in BARD-Web training. In creating this FY09 work product, team members will review the content and level of detail of instruction provided in the NASBLA Comprehensive Class and the accident cause and type definitions currently used in the BARD-Web Online Help-Data dictionary, the working draft of CG-449, and Ohio's "Watercraft Incident Report Manual."
- Also in conjunction with the aforementioned accident report compilations and review, the team recommended further refinement of the draft "Tennessee (local) template" (factors and accident patterns associated with specific bodies of water) that had been described during the progress report, and recommended continued monitoring of a study underway in Florida to determine its potential to serve as a template for state-level analysis of the boat-, human- and external factors.

### **Charge Two (Team leader ~ Dave Harris)**

- In follow-up to preliminary explorations conducted in FY08, the team had identified several deficiencies associated with the data considered for the analysis of operator compliance with safety equipment carriage requirements and had developed draft 'position papers' with an eye toward improving those data sources. However, as a result of the discussions and reports earlier in the meeting day, the team modified the intent of the recommendations to focus on 1) support for BARD-related recommendations proposed by the NBSAC Accident Reporting Task Force regarding the inclusion of safety

equipment carriage requirements as elements of information to be included in reports; and 2) exclusion of the Performance Report Part II statistics as a named data source for the national RBS strategic plan's objective and strategy on operator non-compliance. The team also will make recommendations for additional training for officers nationwide in reporting deficiencies.

- The team further agreed that the data currently available would not allow for determinations as to whether any carriage equipment requirement deficiencies caused or contributed to accidents and that the USCG's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) database and state-specific inspection data would be used to draft the report on compliance rates. The MISLE data (received just prior to the meeting date) was reviewed by the team during the breakout session, and based on that review will be filtered to report nationwide and for selected states (California, Florida, Louisiana and New York). The state-generated inspection data will be selected from (up to five) jurisdictions that reported (via a survey) they have electronic data bases and track individual deficiencies. The team will attempt to get comparable data from the USCG-Auxiliary vessel safety check data.

### **Charge Three (Team leader ~ Tammy Terry)**

- For its continuing analysis of factors associated with 'high risk' boater populations, and especially children and youth (17 years of age and younger), the team confirmed that in its BARD-Web data analysis it would focus on fatality data first, then review the same items for injury data as time allows in the committee cycle. Expectation was to have items completed by mid-April:
  - Finish analysis of data by vessel type (data already in hand, with analysis to be distributed to team members week of March 16);
  - Finish analysis of data by activity (data have been requested of USCG);
  - Finish analysis of data regarding location of victim on vessel/role of supervising adult (from report narratives—data have been requested);
  - Finish analysis of data regarding propeller strikes—increased incidence/ severity (more likely to result in fatality) for certain age groups? (data have been requested);
  - Finish analysis of data by injury type (data have been requested);
  - Finish analysis of data for remaining factors identified in data request to USCG.
- For the charge report, the team agreed to finish its review and summarization of key points from references and resources already identified and uploaded to NASBLA's Basecamp (online project management website), and to compile a matrix to match up with the analysis of the various factors from BARD-Web.
- Also for the charge report—to gather information as to whether states have specific awareness campaigns targeting youth and the potential impact of these campaigns on reducing 'risky' behaviors or situations identified from the BARD data and resource/reference review—the team gave input to charge team 4 (see next page) for a question to add on to that team's planned survey of state campaigns.

#### **Charge Four (Team leader ~ Kim Jackson)**

- For its continuing analysis of vessel accident patterns and the identification of safety practices that have been (or can be) implemented to minimize risk to boaters, the team reported on its work to finalize content areas for a survey of all jurisdictions regarding safety campaigns. The survey will cover three categories of campaigns—education/outreach; special law enforcement/prevention; and special navigational aids—and is intended to supplement resource information already gathered on formal boating education programs and general information on safety campaigns. The team leader will draft the questions based on the discussion, and then send them to the Committee staff liaison for editing/reformatting/and upload to Zoomerang for online survey administration within two weeks of this meeting.
- The team also reported on its review of the preliminary breakdown of injury data by the USCG (mirroring the fatality data already received and analyzed in part toward the end of the FY08 committee cycle). Team members agreed that the USCG staff should proceed with the request for the providing the injury data by the ‘education categories’ or topics that were used to evaluate the fatality data.

#### **Charge Five (Charge leader ~ Deborah Gona)**

- Based on the discussion that took place during the presentation on the charge five draft report (accident reporting gap analysis) earlier in the day and the subsequent discussions regarding the NBSAC Accident Reporting Task Force recommendations, the Committee members in attendance agreed to the following disposition of this charge:
  - Issuance of the final report, based on the summary report provided at the meeting;
  - With the issuance of the report, a recommendation that 1) the charge be deemed “complete,” but 2) that ERAC continue to monitor the outcomes of NBSAC Accident Reporting Task Force recommendations to NBSAC and ultimately to the USCG. The nature of any follow-up work by ERAC in this area will be guided by what happens to those recommendations.

**ATTENDANCE (for all or a portion of meeting)**

Paul Donheffner, OR  
George Green, OK  
Bill Griswold, USBI  
Dave Harris, UT  
Gary Haupt, MO  
Holly Henderson, OK  
Kim Jackson, ID  
Ron Jendro, MT  
Brian Kempf, NY  
Jim Law, USCG  
Eric Lundin, CT  
Kurt McKean, OK  
Eleanor Mariani, CT  
Fred Messmann, NV  
Richard Moore, FL, NASBLA President  
Scott Olson, FL  
Donnie Pritcher, SC  
Ken Ripley, TN, ERAC Vice Chair  
Karen Steely, Aaron Foundation  
Dick Snyder, Mercury Marine (retired)  
Tammy Terry, OH  
Greg Ulkus, CT  
Toby Velasquez, NM, ERAC Chair

**NASBLA staff**

Deborah Gona, ERAC Committee staff  
John Johnson  
Joan Minton

**NASBLA ENGINEERING, REPORTING AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE MEETING  
DOUBLE TREE GUEST SUITES  
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY  
MARCH 6, 2009**

FRIDAY, MARCH 6<sup>TH</sup>

7:30AM – 8:00AM	<i>Continental Breakfast</i>
8:00AM – 8:15AM	Welcome, Opening Remarks, Committee Charge Overview, Committee Goals, Project Leaders, Project Approach, etc. <u>{Chairman Toby Velasquez, Vice Chair Ken Ripley and NASBLA Staff Deb Gona.}</u>
8:15AM – 9:00AM –	Charge #1 work accomplished to date, common issues, obstacles, data analyses, etc. <u>{Project Leader Ken Ripley}</u>
9:00AM – 9:45AM –	Charge #2 work accomplished to date, common issues, obstacles, data analyses, etc. <u>{Project Leader Dave Harris}</u>
9:45AM – 10:00AM–	BREAK
10:00AM – 10:45AM –	Charge #3 work accomplished to date, common issues, obstacles, data analyses, etc. <u>{Project Leader Tammy Terry}</u>
10:45AM – 11:30AM –	Charge #4 work accomplished to date, common issues, obstacles, data analyses, etc. <u>{Project Leader Kim Jackson}</u>
11:30AM – 12:00PM –	Charge #5 work accomplished to date, common issues, obstacles, data analyses, etc. <u>{Project Leader Deb Gona}</u>
12:00PM – 1:00PM--	Working Lunch (Committee member monitoring reports on NBSAC, UL, ABYC, BIRMC)
1:00PM – 2:45PM –	Project groups convene into separate, concurrent work sessions
2:45PM – 3:00PM–	BREAK
3:00PM – 4:30PM –	Project groups convene into separate, concurrent work sessions
4:30PM – 5:30PM -	Full committee reconvenes for review of work and to assess project timelines
5:30PM –	Adjourn for the Day

**APPENDIX –  
COMMITTEE CHARTER, LEADERSHIP/MEMBERSHIP ROSTER, CHARGES**

## Engineering, Reporting & Analysis Committee

### Committee Charter

The Engineering, Reporting & Analysis Committee will work to advance boating safety by analyzing recreational boating accident data and other boating-related statistics for risk factors, patterns and trends that could help to inform policy and program decision making; by examining and recommending improvements to the criteria and methods that are used to report, collect and measure these data and indicators; and by identifying boating safety program and equipment design efforts that can mitigate risks associated with recreational boating.

To inform its work, the Committee also will continue to monitor, participate in and report on the efforts of other key, external task forces and committees. During FY09, these will include the National Boating Safety Advisory Council's Accident Reporting Regulatory Review Task Force; the Underwriters Laboratories PFD Reclassification and Labeling Working Groups; the American Boat and Yacht Council's Product Interface Committee; and the National Marine Manufacturers Association Boating Industry Risk Management Council.

Committee members will be assembled into project teams, taking the lead on specific, assigned charges and monitoring activities.

The Committee will meet March 6, 2009, in Lexington, Kentucky.

### Committee Leadership and Staff

Toby Velasquez, Chair  
New Mexico Boating Safety and Law Enforcement  
Bureau  
505.476.3369  
[tvelasquez@state.nm.us](mailto:tvelasquez@state.nm.us)

Deb Gona, Staff  
NASBLA  
859.421.9258  
[deb@nasbla.org](mailto:deb@nasbla.org)

Ken Ripley, Vice Chair  
Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency  
423.587.7037 ext 474  
[ken.ripley@state.tn.us](mailto:ken.ripley@state.tn.us)

Mike Jendrossek, Representative  
U.S. Coast Guard  
202.372.1052  
[Michael.A.Jendrossek@uscg.mil](mailto:Michael.A.Jendrossek@uscg.mil)

Susan Tomczuk, Representative  
U.S. Coast Guard  
202.372.1103  
[Susan.M.Tomczuk@uscg.mil](mailto:Susan.M.Tomczuk@uscg.mil)



## Engineering, Reporting & Analysis Committee

### State Members:

Nancy Boldt, ND  
Ed Cates, FL / Scott Olson, FL  
Paul Donheffner, OR  
George Green, OK  
Dave Harris, UT  
Gary Haupt, MO  
Carol Havlik, WY  
Holly Henderson, OK  
Kim Jackson, ID

Ron Jendro, MT  
Brian Kempf, NY  
Eric Lundin, CT  
Eleanor Mariani, CT / Greg Ulkus, CT  
Kurt McKean, OK  
Donnie Pritcher, SC  
Ken Ripley, TN  
Tammy Terry, OH  
Stephanie Weatherington, AR

### Associate Members:

Karen Steely, Aaron Foundation  
David Carter, BoatU.S. Foundation  
Ted Sensenbrenner, BoatU.S. Foundation  
Veronica McCann Floyd, Brunswick  
Bruce Rowe, Forever Resorts  
Keith Jackson, Maritech Industries

Dick Snyder, Mercury Marine  
Pete Chisholm, Mercury Marine  
Cindy Squires, NMMA  
Chris Neal, PWIA  
William Griswold, USBI  
Dan Maxim, USCG Auxiliary

## 2009 CHARGES

1. Analyze recreational boating accident data from selected states to describe patterns or trends in types of accidents. In the analyses, identify the human- and boat-related contributing and causal factors, and determine if there are any indications of relationships between accident trends and demographic, economic, climatic, and other "external" trends and patterns. Develop issue brief(s) on findings. Explore development of content for 2009 annual conference session. (Modification of 2008 Carryover Charge. NASBLA Objective 1.4; RBS Performance Goal and Sub-tier Goals; RBS 2.3.1, RBS 6.1, and RBS 9.7)

*Using geographic criteria, boating characteristics and available accident analyses that could serve as templates, ERAC will pick a few states to examine accident patterns and trends over the past 10 years. Beyond learning what the existing data do – and do not – reveal about operator behavior and vessel-related factors in accidents, injuries and fatalities, project team members will begin exploring the possible, relative influence of other factors and trends (including demographic and economic changes). Over time, this project -- initiated in FY08 by an ERAC subcommittee on Accident Reporting & Analysis -- is intended to elicit answers to questions such as: What do these data tell us right now and how can we apply findings so that states can become even more effective in their safety program efforts? Can we really isolate operator- and boat-related factors from other influences to give us a fuller understanding of problem areas now and possibly to anticipate future problems? What are the limitations of these boating accident and other critical data, and what improvements could be made to reporting and collecting these data so that we can better address critical safety issues?*

2. Analyze incidents of and potential trends associated with non-compliance with safety equipment carriage requirements. In developing a revised project work plan, refocus efforts to receive and analyze MISLE and Performance Report Part II datasets. Determine problem areas in non-compliance and in data collection. Develop issue brief on findings, and possible position paper related to data collection. (Modification of 2008 Carryover Charge. NASBLA Objective 1.4; RBS 8.1, 8.2)

*This carryover charge, initiated in FY08 by an ERAC subcommittee on Boats & Associated Equipment, is directly tied to the National RBS Strategic Plan objective for creating a system to evaluate operator compliance with safety equipment, and to strategies in which the states and NASBLA are named as implementing partners. Using various datasets, compliance reports and vessel safety check data, the intent is to identify trends in non-compliance with safety equipment carriage requirements and subsequently to begin targeting problem compliance areas. As in ERAC's charge one, though, there are multiple goals for this second charge -- to issue findings based on the analyses of the available data; to determine how useful the data are in evaluating compliance; and to make recommendations regarding data collection, definitions and reporting, as warranted.*

3. Complete outstanding analyses of factors specific to injuries and fatalities among high-risk boater populations, with a special focus on children and youth ages 17 and under. Issue final report. Explore possible development of content for 2009 annual conference session. (Modification of 2008 Carryover Charge. NASBLA Objectives 1.4, 2.3; RBS Performance Goal and Objective 4, strategy 4.2.1)

*In FY08, an ERAC subcommittee on Special Risks was charged with analyzing boating accident data to begin identifying factors that were specific to injuries and fatalities among high-risk boater populations, and especially among children and youth. Among the variables the group was asked to consider were the frequency and severity of injuries, accident scenarios, and the roles of boating participants. This carryover charge has already resulted in an interim report on initial findings and data challenges, and in FY09, the intent is to complete the outstanding analyses and issue a final report.*

4. Complete outstanding analyses of high-risk vessel accident and fatality patterns and assessment of relationships between those patterns and safety awareness campaigns. Identify and recommend best practices in education and awareness-building that states can implement to minimize risk to participants. Issue final report. Explore possible development of content for 2009 annual conference session. (Modification of 2008 Carryover Charge. NASBLA Objectives 1.4, 2.3; RBS Performance Goal and Objective 2)

*In FY08, as an expansion of an FY07 charge related to paddlesport risks, an ERAC subcommittee on Special Risks was charged with analyzing 'high risk' vessel type fatality and injury rates in the states to assess possible correlations between those rates and the states' safety awareness campaigns. This carryover charge has already resulted in an interim report on initial findings and data challenges, and in FY09, the intent is to complete the remaining data analyses. Based on the findings, the project team will move on to the identification of safety practices that can be implemented to minimize risk.*

5. To assist in efforts to improve the reliability of boating accident reporting, complete compilation and assessment of survey data regarding gaps in reporting. Determine relevance and timeliness to efforts of NBSAC Boating Accident Reporting (Regulatory Review) Task Force. Issue final report. (Modification of 2008 Carryover Charge. RBS 9.2)

*This carryover charge is linked to the National RBS Strategic Plan objective for complete and accurate accident reporting, and more specifically to strategies for increasing reliability by identifying and addressing reporting gaps. In late summer 2007, a workgroup of ERAC's predecessor committee initiated a survey of the states to gather information regarding the states' accident report collection practices for 1) accidents required to be reported, but which the USCG has not been enforcing or encouraging collection; and 2) accident situations outside of the federal reporting requirements. In the first quarter of 2008, even with some jurisdictions' responses outstanding, the ERAC project team developed a summary of issues that had surfaced in the preliminary survey results. The summary and further compilation of responses will be forwarded to the NBSAC Accident Reporting Regulatory Review Task Force for its continuing work. The information needs of that Task Force and the outcomes of its work (in recommending systemic and regulatory changes affecting reporting) will determine whether ERAC follows up with non-respondents to the original survey or coordinates with the Task Force to survey for additional information.*