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What’s in the eight categories of recommendations that came out of the first phase of this project?
1. Incident reporting structure: initial notification of and follow-up on a recreational boating incident

**Recommendations revolve around the:**

- Requirements, roles, expectations for a two-tiered reporting structure
  - First tier -- initial notification from people involved in the incident – and the timeframe for gathering basic information about the incident
  - Second tier -- follow-up by law enforcement on the incident, with fuller collection of information ("all available") report data
Determining which incidents require a report to the Coast Guard (Recreational Boating Incident Report Decision Matrix)

**Recommendations revolve around the:**

- Qualifying conditions under which an incident would require a federal report
  - Where incident occurred
  - Whether met federal report thresholds
  - Types of vessels involved
  - Operational status of the vessels
- ‘Non-reportable’ events
3. Gathering data, reviewing, and submitting final reports

Recommendations revolve around the:

- Timelines, requirements, roles in reviewing, submitting, accepting final -- “all available” -- report data in context of a two-tiered reporting system
4. Vessel determinations

Recommendations revolve around the:

- Parameters for what a “vessel” is for purposes of Coast Guard’s recreational vessel incident reporting program
- Examples of watercraft that should classify as NOT being “vessels”
- Process for making vessel determinations
- Clarification of vessel determinations already issued by the Coast Guard
5. Incident report data elements, fields, definitions

**Recommendations revolve around the**:  
- Parameters for what would constitute “all available” information on an incident for purposes of the national collection  
  - Based on relevance and utility of data currently cited in CFR and Coast Guard BAR form, the elements that should be retained, modified, deleted, or newly collected.  
  - Unless noted as optional/voluntary, recommendations are for mandatory national collection  
- Collection of data on environmental/external factors, where/when incident occurred, vessel characteristics, incident details, damages, people involved
6. Report data input formats (preliminary)

Recommendations revolve around the:

- General data entry
- Methods for documenting injury/damage information outside the report thresholds
7. **Roles and relationships (Coast Guard and States, Coast Guard and other federal entities, States and localities)**

**Recommendations revolve around the:**

- Assumptions of lead investigation of an incident and notification responsibilities
- Responsibilities for collecting – or not collecting – information on incidents that occur on certain waters
- Ultimate determination of reportability of incidents described in news media reports
8. Vessel safety issues, defects, recalls, bridge collisions

**Recommendations revolve around the:**

- Notifications, reporting, and other communications in these areas between Coast Guard and States
- Facilitation of notifications and reporting
What should you keep in mind when you’re reviewing the recommendations?
In the recommendations, “State” = any of the 50 states, DC, or five U.S. territories

the recommendations are NOT presented in regulatory language or formal policy provisions... focus on the substance and don’t try to wordsmith

there are connections between the categories of recommendations and individual recommendations... read through ALL of them first to get the “big picture” look
consult the **background resources** compiled ... they’re intended to give you a better understanding of the project workgroup’s reasoning, intent, considerations behind a recommendation

**involve other personnel / SMEs** in the review ... if we see “competing” or “conflicting” thoughts coming from your State, we’ll let you know

when you/your State offers feedback or asks questions about an individual recommendation – or group of recommendations – that’s **NOT** a vote
What kind of feedback should your State offer during the open comment period?
Is some topic or issue “missing” or not adequately addressed?

**Say what’s missing or inadequate, and why.**
**Offer the core of a recommendation to consider.**

Is a recommendation too vague to be useful?

**Give the extra detail you think should be considered.**

Do you disagree with a recommendation, or aspect of it, or any group of recommendations?

**Why? What would it take for your State to agree with it/them?**
**Propose an alternative for consideration.**
Don’t have an opinion or “known issue” with a recommendation or group of them?

**Say that.**

Generally supportive of or completely in agreement with any recommendation or group of them?

**Say that. It’s important feedback.**