

NASBLA ENGINEERING, REPORTING AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE (ERAC)

March 12, 2026 — MEETING of the FULL COMMITTEE — HIGHLIGHTS and **ACTION ITEMS**

MARRIOTT CITY CENTER – Grand Ballroom E and virtual

121 West Vine Street, Lexington, KY 40507

8:00 a.m. – 4:15 p.m.

RECORDINGS and REFERENCE ITEMS

Note: while the Zoom files are good for the video, the quality of sound captured in the meeting room is not good. Strongly recommend using the audio-only files captured via the digital recorder, with secondary review of the screens via the Zoom recordings.

Zoom files

ERAC March 12 **Morning** session — duration: 03:33:26

https://zoom.us/rec/share/b8PngvG8M4Bz4PsL8nCuPPAvuK_OO4_7zgT6OmiPvMoapt7z-a77ZeCseqGPCKSi.WrjocMUmCBd-vhlu

Passcode: 3!QE=y5N

ERAC March 12 **Afternoon** session — duration: 02:49:58

https://zoom.us/rec/share/sR0QKnYKsg1BMu4Wf7HjbARuSOayPffEpOLVzZI_2cqgEMYTFqJv9LdMY9v0SUFa.i0Nh2ovydhTr6II7

Passcode: z+LN3j#m

Audio-Only (digital recordings; not Zoom) – accessible via public links

ERAC March 12 **Morning** session — two files in a compressed folder (282MB) in Basecamp

<https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/xfdwouMZhdSsCexVH3abPYDM>

ERAC March 12 **Afternoon** session — two files in a compressed folder (214MB) in Basecamp

<https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/ZDjC42VK4deXsJePV4G8VYiK>

Audio-Only of March 10 State RBS Workshop session, "Rebuilding BARD: What's Changing, What's Coming, and What We Need from You." Presenters: Ethan Brininger and Paul Kali, Naval Information Warfare Center-Pacific (NIWC-PAC). Recorded by D. Gona. Workshop_Rebuilding BARD_March 10 2026.mp3 (69.2MB) in Basecamp <https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/qGCSEnqvjyRofDSNzN28YtKY>. See also, [PDF of slides](#) used in presentation.

Meeting materials referenced during March 12 committee discussions

<https://www.nasbla.org/advocacy/erac/meetingmaterials>

MARCH 12 MEETING ATTENDEES — all or portion of meeting day (*= remote) — ERAC Leadership: Tammy Terry (Chair, OH), Adrienne Sullivan (Vice Chair, WI), Stacey Brown (Board Liaison, VA). **State members and state guests:** Grant Brown (CO), Sydney Grant (AR), Deb Green (OH)*, Kim Jackson (AZ), Cody Jones (TX), Nick Korade (FL), Josh Landrum (TN), Jackie Lundstrom (ND)*, Hattan Mollnow (AK)*, Jim Patrillo (VA)*, Mark Sweppenhiser (PA), Samm Teixeira (CA)* **USCG reps:** LCDR Callan Fless*, Jonathan Hsieh*, Tim Rafter*, Rachel Warner*. **Associate members:** Pete Chisholm (Chisholm Marine Consulting)*, Brian Goodwin (ABYC)*, Caroline Mantel (BoatHistoryReport.com). **NIWC-Pacific guests:** Ethan Brininger, Paul Kali. **NASBLA:** Deborah Gona, Ron Sarver*, Garrison Toy

Welcome; introductions; goals; recap of NASBLA State RBS Workshop topics relevant to committee

- **Multiple goals for this meeting:** getting caught up on charge statuses; brainstorming how to better showcase and deliver products in the [Lighthouse](#); finding a way forward on consistent meanings for vessel ownership and considering whether other best practices could be developed in this cycle; receiving high-level initial thoughts about BARD redesign from NIWC guests; discussing the prospects for analyzing the initial distraction data collected by participating states; considering the NASBLA strategic plan activities and how ERAC's activities might roll up into it; and discussing potential improvements to the committee.
- **Workshop presentations relevant to ERAC.** See the [committee briefing](#) (Tammy Terry) to attendees; [CG-BSX-2 presentation on 2025 outcomes and 2026 priorities](#) (Verne Gifford); [CG-BSX-21 program mgt & operations](#) (Jeff Decker); three others – re the “State Guide,” BARD redesign, and NASBLA Strategic Planning will be referenced and linked under agenda topics below.

Working through the [2026 Charges](#) in the order in which they were taken up in the meeting (Note that in some cases, for context, further explanations and links were added after the meeting.)

- **MONITOR/ACT ON USCG POLICY DEVELOPMENT (IR&A 2026-Extension).**
 - Discussion focused on two areas:
 - The Coast Guard's ICR to OMB for approval of the [CG 3865 BAR form](#), without change (per [60-day Federal Register Notice](#) issued December 2025), ERAC's [comments submitted](#) to the docket, and a pending 30-day Notice in which the Coast Guard must respond to the submission; and
 - The continuing interest in the “[State Guide](#)” (the Coast Guard's guidelines for state RBS programs and performance evaluations) which has been in review by NASBLA's Finance & Grants Committee; primary concerns for which the states are being asked by F&G to provide input are regarding the appeals process and the reporting requirements and formulas for determining adequacy of the state programs. For basics, reference [Cody Jones' workshop presentation slides](#).
 - **ACTION ITEMS:**
 - **Develop and send CG-3865 form revision suggestions** (based on [CG-BSX PL 23-01, CH-1](#)) **to Jonathan Hsieh by April 15; Deb Gona will coordinate draft, circulate to committee, and then send final suggestions to Jonathan.**
This is regarding the Coast Guard's current BAR form and the pending 30-day Notice in which the Coast Guard must respond to comments submitted to the 60-day Notice: Although the ERAC comment questioned why the Coast Guard's ICR would be “without change” given that new/revised terms have been made to BARD in accord with [CG-BSX PL 23-01, CH-1](#), the comment did not suggest a resolution. Per Jonathan's request, ERAC will now follow up on its comment and use the opportunity to suggest revisions to the BAR form aligning with the policy letter changes.
 - **State members are encouraged to review the [State Guide](#) and participate, as possible, in the 5 p.m. EDT March 26 Teams meeting to offer input on proposed revisions.**
This is regarding the Teams meeting invitation sent by Taylor Kirshe initially to all BLAs on March 11 (and for forwarding as desired to state staff). On March 15, Deb Gona forwarded the invite to all ERAC non-BLA state members and state guests for consideration. [Update: view [3/26 recording](#) and see [follow-up feedback and resources survey](#).]
- **2026 NRBS – MONITOR USCG/NORC ACTIVITY (S&R 2026-1) – continues next page**
 - Discussions focused on:
 - The survey's March 1 launch. A full year's worth of data will be collected; the initial gathering covers January/February boating activity, but from here on out, will involve monthly collections of data through January 2027. Coverage will be of all 50 states plus D.C.; plan is to have survey data available at the national and state-level.

- A reminder of the two NRBSS components: 1) Exposure survey designed to generate a count of and exposure data for recreational boats, estimates of unregistered vessels, and information on boaters' use of safety equipment and participation in safety courses, among other things; and 2) Participation survey, which looks at boating activity across U.S. households, with data gathered through NORC's AmeriSpeak panel.
- The efforts to maximize paddlecraft and renter participation in the survey. While samples are being pulled from boat registration lists, the push is on to recruit boaters—especially renters and canoeists/kayakers—via an online survey (from which a sample will be pulled—i.e., filling out the recruitment survey does not ensure participation in the NRBSS), marketing/outreach efforts by organizations like ACA and BoatUS Foundation, and assistance from the states in promoting the survey and its validity.

○ **ACTION ITEMS:**

- **Promote the survey in your respective states, with boaters at contact points, with boat rental companies, with boating groups.** Also, send available email lists / contact information for such companies/groups to Jonathan Hsieh ASAP (for height of the boating season).
 - See the [2026 Press Kit](#).
 - See the [NRBSS sticker w/QR code for boater signups](#) (this is a PDF version; stickers are available from USCG). FYI, the QR code leads to: https://norcfed.gov1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0ezfBlrTYxLdG4e.
 - Obtain posters from USCG. See [NRBSS Posters-three](#) (these are PDF versions; prints will be available from USCG)
- **LIGHTHOUSE MAINTENANCE AND ERAC PRODUCT PLACEMENT (K&CM 2026-1)—continues next page**
Recommend supplementing these notes by listening to the [morning AUDIO files](#) for the full discussion on this charge. Audio morning session, part 1: 52:00 to 2:15:50 mark, and audio morning session, part 2: beginning of recording through 15:03 mark for Garrison Toy's clarification of platform capabilities. See first page of this summary for links.
 - Discussion focused on:
 - Driving potential users into the Lighthouse. Dilemmas: Do potential users even know it's there and what's in it, and once they do arrive are they able to search, locate, and use the material inside? Are the titles used in the navigation line and the Lighthouse pages themselves the "right" ones or should they be replaced with descriptors like "policy," "reporting," "analysis"?
 - How we can work around constraints posed by the current NASBLA web platform. Some issues identified for the Lighthouse are part of a bigger set of concerns about the layout, labeling, search capabilities/pathways, and content associated with the NASBLA website.
 - For example, in the search block at the bottom of the NASBLA home page, a search on "electric shock" takes the user to Connect and specifically to the public library and does not catch the electric shock drowning page in the Lighthouse; however, a Google search on NASBLA and electric shock pulls up the Lighthouse ESD resource page.
 - Another issue is the accordion style, which is used in the [FAQ page](#). A search using "find on the page" does not yield results if the term is not in the question or the response(s) have not been expanded. However, a Google search on, for example, "mobile device," which is embedded in the answer to a question about Personal Property, does yield a find if the search includes "NASBLA" along with "mobile device."
 - The "best" ways to get notifications of products to users.
 - The possibility of creating tie-ins between the Lighthouse resources and the new BARD system—i.e., a way to provide more context (e.g., policy provisions) and explanations (e.g., definitions of report terms) when users are entering and submitting report data.

- How we will know if the recent and near future revisions to the Lighthouse have been and/or will be effective in driving users to the pages.

○ **ACTION ITEMS:**

- **Develop text for and request Lighthouse-related displays, modifications, and additions to the NASBLA home page, including: adding a box for incident reporting alongside the current education & training boxes—i.e., the boating course approval and training items mid-page, under the latest news section; adding a home page slider/banner highlighting a particular resource; and moving the home page search box from its current position at the bottom of the page.**
- **Retain the Lighthouse brand and label, but slot it in navigation under appropriate, meaningful function(s)/topic(s) by taking multiple actions:**
 - Request that the entire top navigation bar on the NASBLA home page be evaluated and revised (labels to be determined). Stacey Brown to take request to the board.
 - Create a “cheat sheet,” index, or some other grouping by type of users that can live on top of the Lighthouse launch page or be an add-on page leading into the Lighthouse.
 - For illustration, see Paul Kali’s [draft mockup](#).
- **Develop a schedule for and guidance on notifications / promotions in NASBLA Weekly, social media, on NASBLA home page, events, etc.** Make use of the digital guidebook for workshop/conference. Consider the timeliness of the issues in promoting applicable products (e.g., for officers/ investigators in the ramp up of boating season; info for new BLAs and for Leadership Academy attendees). Use pointed questions and/or short blurbs
- **Explore suggested partnerships between NASBLA/ERAC and the Coast Guard to effectively integrate the Lighthouse resources into the new BARD (as a HELP resource and/or tool tips).**
- **NOTE: Following the main discussion on this charge, the committee sought NASBLA Communications & Marketing Manager Garrison Toy’s counsel as to whether the group’s suggestions for modification would be possible. Preliminary outcomes:**
 - Sliders/banners on the NASBLA home page can be accommodated.
 - A landing page for the Lighthouse is a possibility.
 - The Search block on the NASBLA home page can be moved. Of note is that searches currently go to Connect because for Higher Logic that *is* the “main” website; however, it might be possible to tweak the search so that it defaults to the NASBLA webpages.
 - A box on the NASBLA home page (to move users into the Lighthouse components), like those currently in place for Education and Training could be accommodated.
 - Not sure whether longer navigation titles – like “Reporting & Data” – can be accommodated; will need to see how it wraps.
 - Consider a series of videos on the different Lighthouse components.
 - It should be possible to get more granular analytics (page level); if nothing else, a heat map is a possibility.
- Ultimately, the consensus among attendees was to fix what can be fixed now, but look to possible future improvements/revisions to the NASBLA website.

- **DISTRACTION DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION (IR&A 2026-3)**

Recommend supplementing these notes by listening to [morning AUDIO files](#) for all detail. Audio morning session, part 2: 15:03 mark through end of file. See first page of this summary for links.

- Discussion focused on:

- What states are on board and collecting the distraction data, how much data do we already have, and what can we do with it?
- The prevalence of incidents involving operator inattention and/or improper lookout *nationally*. There will be variations in volume among individual states.
- The utility of collecting distraction data systematically at this level of detail. For officers charging an operator, the extra information as to **why** those behaviors occurred can be pulled from narratives; but when there is public, legislative, or industry interest, compiling and quantifying that information can make a case for action (e.g., enforcement, education, targeted safety messaging/campaigns, equipment modifications, etc.).
- Florida, Tennessee, and South Carolina are collecting the distraction codes. All three use SmartCop with a drop-down for capture. North Carolina, West Virginia, and Alabama are interested and/or in process of doing so when they move to SmartCop.
- The immediate next steps? Figure out the best way to extract and get that data into a shared location for participating states; then evaluate the data and processes to decide on any changes.
- Questions about the volume of and meaningfulness of the data being collected (e.g., in Tennessee, of 184 incidents in 2025, only 10 had distractions attached; but of those, 40 percent involved cell phones / electronic equipment in use).
- Fostering consistency of capture. For example, in the current setup for SmartCop users, distractions are captured for operator inattention/improper lookout whether it/they are the primary, secondary, or tertiary contributor. That should be the case no matter what system/collection process a state is using.
- Since current BARD cannot accommodate these codes, how a state without SmartCop or other third-party system can easily incorporate collection—e.g., manual collection using the [form](#) or coding at the bottom of narrative and inputting results into a spreadsheet.
- What instruction should be given to participating (or interested) states for consistent collection of data fields? (e.g., the count when multiple vessels / distracted operators are involved (as two incidents for purposes of recording the distractions; analysis at incident or vessel level, etc.).

- **ACTION ITEMS (3rd and 4th bullets should happen ASAP to foster consistency)**

- **Follow up with North Carolina, West Virginia, and Alabama**, regarding the status of their transition to SmartCop.
- **Ohio, Arkansas, and Pennsylvania will begin manual tracking for 2026 (by vessel involved and using the [form](#), spreadsheets, etc.), and may go back into 2025 data.**
- **Develop basic guidance for participating states to encourage consistent collection and incorporation of same fields for the analysis.** See also [form](#), [2025 workshop presentation](#).
 - **Confirm fields that should be added to the compilation/analysis besides the contributor** (e.g., time of day, visibility, “none,” “unknown” or a complete pull from BARD of all fields associated with the incident).
- **Determine the best way to pool this distraction data** for evaluation across participating states (e.g., a holding place like a Teams folder?).
- **By July 1, participating states should compile their 2025 data. By Jan/Feb 2027, have compilation of the 2026 data as part of the wrap-up / end of CY reporting.** Work toward presenting findings at a 2027 NASBLA State RBS Workshop session.

- **REPORTING SYSTEM REDESIGN –INCIDENT REPORTING (IR&A 2026-2)** **Given level of detail presented and attendee questions during this session, recommend reviewing the [afternoon part 1 audio file](#) (in the afternoon audio folder) and for video, see the [Zoom afternoon session](#), passcode: z+LN3j#m (beginning of video to the 01:19:38 mark.**

For additional background/context, listen to audio of March 10 State RBS Workshop session, "Rebuilding BARD: What's Changing, What's Coming, and What We Need from You. Recorded by D. Gona. Workshop_Rebuilding BARD_March 10 2026.mp3 (69.2MB), is a public file at <https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/qGCSEngviyRofDSNzN28YtKY>. See also the [PDF of slides](#) used in the presentation.

- Discussion included:
 - Reactions to the conceptual framework for the BARD redesign as described by Ethan Brininger and demonstrated by Paul Kali (NIWC).
 - At this still-early stage, a request to ERAC for feedback and validation from committee members and meeting guests as to whether the layout, content, identification of user roles, workflow, report requirements, etc., as presented are generally headed in the right direction or are off track (there will be opportunities for more specifics and detailed feedback later). Overall feedback on concepts and screens was positive.
 - Areas where report data revisions / updates have not been fully captured in this early stage (e.g., incorporation of provisions and terms from [CG-BSX PL 23-01, CH-1](#), and consideration of the consensus recommendations for clarifications / revisions on all data elements (including, but not limited to all major categories of report terms and definitions) as presented in section 5 and a summary chart in the [2020 Incident Reporting Policy Project](#).
- **ACTION ITEMS:**
 - **For upcoming testing, NIWC team to identify additional states** (e.g., Texas, California) **and user types beyond those already represented on ERAC.** [Note: states currently represented on committee: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin.]
 - **Forward to NIWC team the consensus recommendations from the [2020 Incident Reporting Policy Project](#). This report** (as accepted by NASBLA membership in 2020 and delivered to CG-BSX) **contains recommended revisions/clarifications associated with all report data elements/fields/definitions** [**Update:** Project documents, including separate item "[Data Elements FINAL w CFR or BAR indications July 15 2022.xlsx](#)", were forwarded to Ethan and Paul on March 13.]
- **BEST PRACTICES DEVELOPMENT—INCIDENT REPORTING (IR&A 2026-1)—continues next page**
 - Discussion focused on:
 - What can be accomplished in this cycle regarding:
 - Aspects of incident reporting deserving of best practices development that have yet to be addressed from the Incident Reporting Policy Project (2020) (see the [spreadsheet initiated in 2020, a.k.a. the "big list"](#));
 - Problem areas identified by CG-BSX in reviewing 2025 incident reports that suggest states are mis-coding / misinterpreting certain provisions in CG-BSX PL 23-01, CH-1 (see a [preliminary list of coding issues from a March 2025 review of 2024 reports](#) and items mentioned in the team's [Feb. 18 starter list](#));
 - Action to address probable inconsistencies in states' reporting on vessel ownership statuses (for background/context, see the [interim report from 2025](#)).
 - The committee did not rehash the meaning of vessel ownership statuses of interest -- "owned," "borrowed," "rented" or the specifics of how to create standardized

“definitions” or guidance for the states to follow in recording each of these. Instead, discussion centered on the magnitude of the issues involved and the relevance / value of cleaning up these statuses. What would we use the “improved” data for?

- Ultimately, the focus was on what we currently do not know about how the states’ entries (or missing fields) on owned and rented (see “[OWNERSHIP STATUS ST.xlsx](#)”) are funneled up into the statistics cited in Table 14 of the annual report as “rented,” “not rented,” and “unknown.”

- **ACTION ITEMS:**

- **Review the “[big list](#),” the working spreadsheet of items so noted in the Incident Reporting Policy Project [consensus recommendations](#) (2020), to identify potential “low hanging fruit” (i.e., that would be of benefit to the states if best practices were developed and could be completed this cycle).**
- **For the next team meeting (date TBD) evaluate the magnitude of the issues regarding vessel ownership and gain more insights into whether it is worthwhile developing guidance, by gathering some additional information:**
 - Discover how the [states’ coding of ownership status](#) map into the categories reported out in the Coast Guard’s annual statistics (Table 14) (assigned to Jonathan).
 - Run 2024 data (available via Access and Excel bases below) on ownership status against injuries, fatalities, education, experience on vessel, state of operation, total loss, etc. (assigned to Tammy):
 - Access base <https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/L6Yjox2mrEVx7soqeJ3cd7Je>
 - Excel base <https://public.3.basecamp.com/p/1jJ3yJBuO46HTeAgydiaUvcM>
 - **After the 2025 boating statistics are released, a post-mortem on what the BARD reviewers discovered in the way of coding issues, especially those associated with the states’ implementation of the provisions and terms incorporated into CG-BSX PL 23-01, CH-1.** Intent would be to identify potential remedies – either by reinforcing application of guidance from existing products or developing new guidance/direction.

Not a charge ... but an assignment nonetheless:

- **NASBLA’S STRATEGIC PLAN – HOW DOES ERAC FIT IN?**

- Discussion focused on:
 - Reminder to the committee that the strategic planning process began in 2025, with an interactive session at the State RBS Workshop.
 - A workgroup that was formed in the wake of that initial feedback (and included four ERAC members! Stacey Brown, Tammy Terry, Josh Landrum, and Mark Sweppenhiser.
 - A session conducted at this year’s workshop (3/11) with a [presentation](#) of the work to date.

- **ACTION ITEMS**

- Review the [presentation slides](#).
- Think about what this draft plan might mean for ERAC in future implementation. Spend time at the goals level—how does ERAC’s work fit in to the plan?
- Send thoughts about the plan to Tammy, Stacey, and/or Deb as the workgroup and then NASBLA staff continue discussions at the end of March/end of April, respectively.