

## **NASBLA ENGINEERING, REPORTING AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE (ERAC)**

**TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2015, 8:00 a.m.-5:15 p.m.**

**Conducted in UK National Center for Innovation in Education and NASBLA HQ Meeting Rooms  
1648 McGrathiana Pkwy., Lexington, KY**

**ATTENDEES (in-person, and remote (for portions of day))<sup>1</sup>** -- **ERAC leadership:** Tammy Terry, OH (Chair, presiding); Glenn Moates, TN (Vice Chair). **Other State members:** John Girvalakis, MA; Rachel Graham, OR (remote); Penny Kanable, WI; Eric Lundin, CT; Joe McCullough, AK; Johanna Naughton, CA; Amy Rigby, CA; Kris Wahlers, CO (remote). **NASBLA program representative:** Gary Haupt, Boating Accident Investigation Training (remote). **U.S. Coast Guard representative to ERAC:** Susan Weber (remote). **Other U.S. Coast Guard representatives:** Philippe Gwet (remote); Don Kerlin (remote). **Associate members:** Pete Chisholm, Mercury Marine (remote); Ernie Marshburn, USPS (remote); Dan Maxim, CG-AUX; Dick Snyder, Mercury Marine (ret.). **State Guest (for A3 breakout):** George Birdwell, TN. **NASBLA:** John Johnson (CEO/Executive Director). **ERAC Staff:** Deborah Gona (NASBLA Research Consultant).

This summary describes the day's major activities, discussion points, and action items. It is not intended to serve as a transcript. However, the meeting sessions were recorded using a digital recorder and ReadyTalk audio recording; the .mp3 files (posted May 13 and 17, 2015) are available to committee members in the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** files on NASBLA's Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/5486330/files>.

### **AUDIO FILES**

#### **Full sessions**

Introduction and stage-setting (length 1:03:02; 88 MB)

Spatial analysis (Marshburn) presentation segment only (length 33:03; 46 MB)

Roundtable on charges and other activities (length 1:28:39; 124 MB)

Triage, Most Wanted List, Lighthouse (length 58:24; 82 MB)

Breakout reports - wrap up for the day (length 1:26:35; 10 MB)

#### **Breakout sessions**

A3 ESD (length 31:49; 3.7 MB)

C1 NRBS (length 50:28; 5.9 MB)

B4 and B5 charges (length 1:07:44; 7.9 MB)

E charges (length 1:12:43; 8.5 MB)

Meeting materials will remain available for download from a temporary webpage (URL provided to members only) on the NASBLA Lighthouse, through the end of the current committee cycle, and will also be uploaded to the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** (<https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/5486330/log>) and other ERAC Basecamp project areas as applicable.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Remote" means attendee participated in the meeting by teleconference for some segment of the agenda.

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Call to order / introductions / housekeeping

- **Welcomes and introductions.** Chair Tammy Terry opened the meeting, and welcomed members who were able to make it to Lexington for this rescheduled meeting.<sup>2</sup> In-person and remote attendees introduced themselves, and Tammy named others who were expected to join on the teleconference at various points during the day. See page 1 for **Attendees** list.
- **Quorum met.** Eight state members (representing seven states) attended in person, and two other state members participated from remote locations for portions of the agenda. One state member and the Board Liaison to ERAC were unavailable to attend in person or by phone. A quorum was present for purposes of conducting official committee business. No votes were taken during the course of the meeting.

### Setting the stage

- **Delays in this cycle.** Tammy noted that this spring has had some twists and turns,<sup>3</sup> making it an “odd year,” from her point of view, for getting some things off the ground. However, she expected some of that could be turned around at this meeting.
- **What’s going on around us?** Tammy pointed out that there is a lot going on around ERAC— other NASBLA committees working on charges, and in some cases, facing similar challenges; external organizations and agencies moving on their projects; and the Coast Guard, hopefully, acting on accident reporting rulemaking and other anticipated guidance items soon. Updates on some of those activities would subsequently be covered during the meeting’s **Roundtable**.
- **ERAC as a “hub.”** In describing those activities, Tammy reminded the committee of where ERAC fits in, and how it serves as a kind of “hub”—i.e., the work ERAC does and the things committee members look at touch upon aspects of the other NASBLA policy committees, and in turn, ERAC needs to be aware of other organizational and agency projects relevant to its work.
- **Reminders for the charge work.** As teams continue to work through charges today and beyond, Tammy asked that they keep in mind the relevance of current efforts at the national level involving, among other things, updates to the National RBS Strategic Plan. She also expressed hope that the teams could, with consent, and within the confines of the meeting today, factor in the results from the Coast Guard’s 2014 annual statistical report, which was scheduled for official release the following day.
- **Preparing for the end-of-day report out.** For the afternoon charge breakout sessions, Tammy asked teams to identify the likely charge product(s), including possible conference sessions; sketch out what can realistically be done between now and September (major action steps and milestones); come up with at least one measure of effectiveness (or uniformity) and/or evaluate related measures developed earlier this year as part of a NASBLA non-profit grant proposal to

---

<sup>2</sup> This meeting was rescheduled from the original March 6 date due to winter storm.

<sup>3</sup> Among them, the rescheduling of the meeting from March to May; some charge-related decisions delayed due to timing of NASBLA’s 2014 annual conference; and approval of topics from ERAC triage process in mid-1<sup>st</sup> Q CY 2015.

the U.S. Coast Guard; and finally, consider whether anything rises to consideration for NASBLA’s “most wanted” list of safety improvements (see page 11 of this summary).

- **As possible--and especially in the case of charges slated for completion in this 2015 cycle--charge teams should target beginning to mid-June for producing product drafts or for near-completion of specific, major charge tasks.** This will give sufficient time for the team(s) and committee to review item(s) as needed and conduct follow-up work in the weeks leading to key status report and committee product delivery dates. Those are: the week of July 19, when the NASBLA Executive Board meets in conjunction with the Leadership Academy; and then Sept. 13-16, for the NASBLA Annual Conference.
- **Examples of recent success stories.** Tammy pointed to ERAC charges that have already had an impact on other organizational products or were recently “accomplished.”
  - One was regarding the NASBLA Boating Accident Investigation training modules and member Gary Haupt’s incorporation of some content from the human factors work and information from continuing efforts in the area of electric shock drownings (ESD). [Note: Gary joined the meeting via teleconference in time for the end-of-day charge breakout reports/wrap up; he relayed his impressions of the effectiveness in incorporating the human factors information and terminology--especially as to distractions and preconditions--into the modules and the benefit to the trainees.]
  - Another was regarding the **D2 charge** associated with the investigative study (first iteration) completed by Ernie Marshburn. Ernie, participating via telephone, gave an overview of the study and delivered an abbreviated presentation of one he had given the BLAs at the March 2015 Workshop.
    - See the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** project area of Basecamp <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/5486330/files> for the PowerPoint and audio files associated with his presentation, “**Beyond Human Factors: Examining the Underlying Determinants of Recreational Boating Accidents with Spatial Analysis and Modeling**” (using two sites in Florida and Ohio).
    - The next step is to expand the study and see if it can be applied more broadly; as a result of the Workshop presentation, more than 10 states had expressed interest in being put on a “wait list” for consideration and potential inclusion as one of 10 research sites written into the next grant proposal.
    - **Any ERAC member state that has a question about or interest in participating in the next round should contact Ernie directly ([marshburne@ecu.edu](mailto:marshburne@ecu.edu)).**
  - A third project, the **NASBLA Lighthouse**, was covered briefly by team leader Kris Wahlers participating via telephone (see further coverage, pp. 11-12 of this summary)
    - Kris relayed that the Lighthouse—webpages and the discussion and library components on NASBLA Connect—was up and running in time for the 2014 NASBLA Annual Conference, and also was the subject of a presentation he delivered at the 2015 International Boating & Water Safety Summit (April 1).
    - However, he said that for it to succeed, it needs to be more interactive—
      - More members need to join the Lighthouse community on Connect to participate in the discussions and access the library holdings; and

- The content of the discussions and library needs to be kept fresh and current. Kris said he hoped members would brainstorm possible topics for discussion during this meeting.
- **All ERAC members should join the Lighthouse community on Connect at <http://tinyurl.com/q5dg5wp>; see [instructions](#) for access and site navigation.**

## Roundtable on ERAC charges, other NASBLA activities, other partner initiatives

For ERAC charge language, see the 2015 [charter/roster/charges document](#). For further information and comments resulting from breakout sessions, see **Charge breakout reports** (pp. 12-16 and **Appendix A**)

Tammy asked the charge leaders (or designees in their absence) to briefly recap what their charge is about; any work already done; and, as applicable, what they anticipated working on in their breakout.

### **A1–Accident report terms & definitions rollout guidance** (standing charge, reported by Tammy Terry).

- Charge is intended to provide an outlet for states to ask assistance if they have already begun incorporating the terms & definitions project lists approved by NASBLA membership 2012/2013.
- A few states came to ERAC with questions in the summer of 2014; since then, no other inquiries.
- Tammy attributed this, in part, to the fact that **changes in BARD-Web have been put on hold pending further action by the Coast Guard on accident reporting rulemaking and/or the release and approval of the Commandant’s Instructions on accident reporting**. Susan Weber confirmed that those restrictions regarding BARD-Web changes are still in place.

### **A2 – Input to U.S. Coast Guard policy- and rule-making proposals** (standing charge, reported by Tammy Terry). For descriptions of published notices and final rules, see NASBLA’s Policy/Federal Register webpage at <http://www.nasbla.org/content.asp?contentid=276>.

- Charge is intended to cover more areas of interest than just accident reporting policy guidance.
- However, before addressing the other regulatory and policy areas, Tammy requested an update from Susan Weber on the status of the **Commandant’s Instruction re accident reporting**.
  - Susan said the draft has been back and forth from clearance to the Office to address internal comments; after the comments are addressed and cleared, the hope is to put it out for public comment using a Federal Register notice; no timeline identified.
- **Whenever the Commandant’s Instruction is issued for comment, Tammy will convene the committee via teleconference; the hope also is to use the Lighthouse community on Connect as an open forum for discussing issues likely to arise from review of the document.**
- An item from last fall was the Coast Guard’s **Federal Register notice of intent to submit an Information Collection Request to OMB for approval of the State Registration Data collection** to which a few states and NASBLA responded.

- Susan confirmed that the new collection form [included in supplemental materials in the docket] is not yet approved for use; no states used it in the most recent collection.
- The Coast Guard is trying to get the form approved by OMB well before Jan. 1, 2017 [deadline for implementing changes to SNS/VIS/BARD], so states have time to adjust.
- The Coast Guard plans to create a document to assist states in remapping their registration data in the event the new form is approved for use before January 2017.
- **Susan expects a 30-day notice to be issued this summer with response to comments submitted during the initial 60-day comment period.**
- A final item was the 2014 “**preemption assessment framework**” notice of proposed rulemaking [issued by the Coast Guard’s Office of Maritime & International Law] to which a few states and NASBLA responded; to date, there has been no follow-up.
  - **The notice was almost overlooked because the potential implications for RBS were not immediately evident. Although Deb Gona gets Federal Register alerts, the team should send word if they--or other personnel in their states, agencies, or organizations who regularly track legislative/regulatory activity--find something of possible interest.**

### **A3 – Electric Shock Drowning (ESD) issues/guidance** (carryover charge, reported by Eric Lundin).

- Charge is intended to bring together different resources on ESD for use by investigators, officers, BLAs, and potentially state legislators. Most of the resources, Eric noted, are already available from other organizations, including ABYC and BoatU.S.
- Tammy reminded the group that the initial charge proposal was to create a model act toward mitigation of electric shock drownings. However, given the differences in the way states do things, the preference was to shift focus toward legislative guidance or best practices.
- Charge activity includes developing a draft checklist intended for investigators to use if ESD is suspected [draft ready to be reviewed/refined by team]; the start of legislative guidance (“best practices”), also to be reviewed; and identification of resources (or links) for the Lighthouse.
  - For the afternoon breakout session, George Birdwell, TN (attending the NASBLA VIRT meeting also held May 12) was invited to participate and share background on his state’s legislative experience in this area.
  - Charge items available on the meeting materials webpage include state legislative activity, additional recent resources that had not yet been posted to Basecamp, and the drafts for discussion [the investigator checklist; legislative guidance, which could morph into use on issues other than ESD; and a FAQ piece to serve as a basic resource].

---

Before moving to the “B” charges, Tammy advised that Parasailing Safety, a proposed “A” charge on the original 2015 list, is now being handled solely by NASBLA’s Enforcement & Training Committee as opposed to it being a joint charge between committees. Upon request, however, ERAC is willing to assist in reviewing any resulting product.

**B1 – [Terms and Definitions] Reference and resource modules (continuing development and module additions)** (standing charge, reported by Tammy Terry).

- Nothing new to report regarding additional content; all items received last year have been incorporated into the latest version that was released before NASBLA's 2014 annual conference (version 2013.2, available in a zip file (250 MB) in the Lighthouse Library on Connect).
- After the **Commandant's Instruction on accident reporting is released and approved, some of the module's content may need to be revisited by the charge team.**
- Two new 2015 charges relate to this one, and if the modules eventually move into a web-based platform, content from B4 on accident report narratives, in particular, *might* be added.

**B2 – The NASBLA Lighthouse forum** (carryover charge, covered in next session).

**B3 -- State-level statistical report template** (carryover charge, reported by Glenn Moates on behalf of himself and co-leader Paul Newman).

- Some states maintain their own accident databases and produce their own reports. This charge is primarily intended to give states that do not have those resources the ability to produce their own reports from BARD [note: however, even some states that currently produce a report have already expressed interest in the template to make parts of their work easier.]
- Most of the template work has been done; the biggest decisions have been made as to what should go into it. Bulk of the report is made up of the data tables to be pulled from BARD, largely statistics on accidents by various categories (e.g., time of day, vessel length, type, etc.).
- As part of the outside-the-team review, requests for review of the working draft were sent to all states (to all ERAC members and to the BLAs and BARD contacts); comments were received from WI, MA, SD, and MS. Feedback, though minimal, has been favorable, with a plus being the expected ability for users to cut and paste what they want from the Word-format report.
- The team will get the product into close-to-final form so that it can be given over to the Coast Guard to begin working with CNSI (BARD contractor) for development in the BARD system.
- **As the product is being developed in the system, the team may need to enlist a couple of states (apart from those already represented on the team) to beta test the template. Any ERAC member with an interest should let the team know (via Deb Gona).**

**B4 – Quality of accident report narratives** (new charge, reported by Tammy Terry on behalf of Seth Wagner).

- Issues about narratives had been discussed in committee before; however, a formal charge did not emerge until this topic was submitted and vetted in the ERAC triage process this year.
- The team has had one teleconference to date (joint call with charge B5), and is in the process of identifying key components of a narrative, using a Basecamp Writeboard at

<https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/W5977219> to gather suggestions; as part of this, it is also collecting examples of “good” vs. “bad” narratives.

- Expectation is that the work on this charge should move quickly, and result in creation of a training product(s) in the form of a module or some other appropriate delivery format(s).
- Note: two additional members joined the charge team at this meeting: Johanna Naughton and Amy Rigby.

**B5 – Documenting alcohol/drug involvement in accidents** (new charge, reported by Eric Lundin (on behalf of himself and co-leader Seth Wagner); and Tammy Terry).

- Like B4, this new charge also emerged from the ERAC triage process; as recommended in the triage, it is expected to require coordination with the Enforcement & Training Committee (in next cycle) and may be a “heavier lift” than B4 in terms of how best to address the more consistent capture of this information given states’ variations in practice.
- Initial activity has involved collecting states’ boating accident report forms (officer and operator, as applicable) to begin analyzing how the information on alcohol and drug involvement is currently captured and what might serve as “best practice” [note: BAR forms received to date are on Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/12735822/files>; they will be used for other purposes beyond this charge and likely be made available as part of the Lighthouse].
- Several studies on drinking and fatalities provided by Dan Maxim have also been uploaded to the Basecamp B5 Files. The significance of the studies’ findings for this charge, Dan noted, is that “bad things” can begin to happen even if the operator has not reached legal intoxication. The studies calculate the incremental risk.
- As in the case of B4, a Writeboard has been started on Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/W5977234> to capture scenarios for alcohol “involvement” that may or may not be so obvious (e.g., an intoxicated passenger(s) who distracts the operator).
- Note: two additional members joined the charge team at this meeting: Johanna Naughton and Amy Rigby.

**C1 –National Recreational Boating Survey priority research** (carryover charge, reported by Tammy Terry).

- This charge continues work begun last year on the 2012 data [released 2014]; anticipate near-completion of current work in July.
- Team emerged from the last cycle with a list of possible research topics and narrowed to three:
  - Assess pros/cons of registered vessels vs. exposure hours as rate denominators; purpose being to identify the advantages and disadvantages of each. Part of this work also is to assess whether other variable(s) could be used as interim “surrogates” or indicators for the exposure hours to help indicate up and down patterns between survey collections. Team received a report drafted by Dan Maxim (see [A Discussion of](#)

[Recreational Boating Fatality Statistics and Rate Normalization](#)) and will review its content at breakout.

- Assess the fatality victim’s locality (state where accident occurred) vs. their residence for the impact on a state’s casualty numbers and rates [one argument being that the calculation of a state’s fatality rate includes victims for whom they had no opportunity to impact with their boating safety education programs]. Some initial individual state data has been run; team would like to run numbers for all states.
- Review outcomes of other surveys conducted in the 2012 timeframe to see what kinds of differences in findings there might be and why.

**C2 – Human factors—applying best practices for gathering/examining data** (carryover charge reported by Glenn Moates and Dan Maxim).

- Traditionally, investigators have looked at some human factors (e.g., alcohol use, no lookout, etc.), but there is more going on with operators and passengers that could be issues (such as distractions, sleep and work patterns, mental history, etc.). Toward that, in 2014, the team created a “best practices” guide for investigators [based on adaptation of DOD HFACS and NTSB work] on how to collect more of this information.
- Guide includes background, sources of information, considerations for the investigator (e.g., the dual purposes of collecting data and conducting a criminal investigation could impact the questions asked and information gathered), a checklist, and a form to keep collection on track.
- **Now, the team is seeking a few states to take this on as a pilot, with the focus on collecting data on fatalities; will need to assess how the collection form would work in the individual states and within their existing systems. In working with pilot states, the team might need to be flexible and negotiate possible changes in the form and other details (e.g., partial year).**
  - Dan Maxim said, per a conversation with Richard Moore at the PFDMA annual meeting, that Florida would like to participate. Connecticut is also a prospect. At this meeting, California also indicated interest, but suggested the ERAC charge team work might work directly with the collecting agency (typically sheriff’s offices) in light of some of the issues associated with the state’s confidentiality and other restrictions.
- ERAC will continue to monitor and offer assistance to other NASBLA components’ human factors-related work—though, thus far, indications are that such work would focus on government agency/internal incidents where HFACS components regarding supervision and management safety culture (not included in C2’s “HFACS-lite”) are germane.

**D1 – Implement triage procedure developed in 2014** (standing charge, reported by Tammy Terry).

- Procedure was developed by 2014 team in response to how the committee was (or was not) dealing with issues identified throughout the year. The new 2015 charges resulted from this process. Another triage teleconference should take place by end of June (per provision for quarterly meetings). [More time would be spent discussing the triage in the next session (p. 10)]

**E Charges: E1 – Scope/nature of engineering-/equipment-related issues (initial year/exploratory); E2 - Basic flotation issues re canoes/kayaks (initial work); E3 – Data on vessel theft-related issues (new charges, introduced by Tammy Terry, with further reporting by Joe McCullough and Dick Snyder)**

- These three related charges emerged from a combination of percolating interest within the committee and triage submissions, as Tammy described. “Engineering” is part of the committee’s title, but over time, with shifting focus and limited resources, those issues were set aside; the triage –and in particular– a suggestion from Jeff Johnson, AK BLA, revived consideration of how ERAC could best get back to formally working in this area (i.e., What’s going on? How many issues of importance are there (for ERAC to take up)? How should the work be organized?). Because of the lateness in getting into these issues in this cycle, the charges will be more exploratory, with the committee looking to develop more tangible products in 2016.
- Joe added that a primary intent is to make sure that ERAC is working with NASBLA at-large to identify and prioritize the bigger issues among the states; that is a focus of the E1 charge. In the meantime, two related charges, also identified through the submission and triage process, would be taken up while the exploratory work is conducted in E1.
- Regarding the E2 flotation charge, Dick (who submitted the charge suggestion) noted that he thought data needs to be gathered on a few fronts.
  - For one thing, he used as an example BAD reports of accidents involving canoes tipping over and occupant(s) dying either because they were not wearing life jackets or because the canoe “sank.” He questioned how some of these incidents happened if the canoe were floating (could the occupant(s) not grab hold?). How many actually involved the canoe “sinking” – to the bottom—and how many, when they filled with water, were inaccurately reported as having “sunk.”
  - On another front, Dick wondered how many canoe/kayak manufacturers are NMMA members as, in order to be certified, they would be required to follow the [ABYC] H-29 standard; as such, he said the team should try to get some of NMMA’s data.
  - Tammy summed up the primary tasks as determining the extent of the problem; then, perhaps, considering how to standardize use of “sink” (“sank”) for more meaningful and accurate reporting; and finally, sorting through costs/benefits of any suggested changes.
  - [Note: this charge team will be led by Brian Goodwin and Alex Cascione, neither of whom could be present for this meeting.]
- Regarding the short-term E3 vessel theft issues charge (to be led by Eric Lundin), the International Association of Marine Investigators (IAMI) is thought to be a potential source of data. The team will need to sketch out a timeline for its work, and then any data identified and then, per the triage recommendation, findings will be passed on to Enforcement & Training in the event that committee has any interest in taking up the issue(s) in the future.
- Before leaving this “E series,” and expanding on Joe’s initial comments, Deb Gona reminded that with regard to NASBLA/ERAC doing a better job of tracking engineering/equipment issues, **the team will need to factor in and take action on two recommendations that emerged from the triage process:**

- One is to more closely monitor the actions of and stay in touch with the NBSAC Boats & Associated Equipment Subcommittee. Toward that, there has been recent correspondence with Subcommittee Chair Dave Marlow, and ERAC will update the subcommittee on its initial work (via brief written update) for the May NBSAC meeting;
- A second is to capture (via quick survey to BLAs) issues that states see as most pressing.

#### Other NASBLA and partner organization activities – other issues to consider as charge work proceeds

- **NASBLA Ad Hoc Committee on Paddlesports** (reported by Deb Gona):
  - Created in March by NASBLA’s Executive Board; Wade Alonzo, BLA WA State, is chair;
  - Purposes are to gather information on and consolidate some of the related work going on across NASBLA committees; to better understand what individual states are doing to be more proactive in this area and how they are using their resources; and to further engage the paddlesports community;
  - More detail on ad hoc committee membership, resources and tasks will be passed along as it becomes available.
- **Keeping in touch with NBSAC:**
  - Pete Chisholm, who serves on the Council, reminded that there are several members who can ensure the lines of communication are open between the groups;
  - Crossover between NBSAC and ERAC (or ERAC partners) includes Pete, Dan Maxim, Ernie Marshburn, and Jeff Johnson (via Joe McCullough).
- **Other issues associated with electronics and impact on recreational boating** (described by Dan Maxim):
  - Virtual aids to navigation: Coast Guard is “developing the future of navigation”; among other things, that means the growing integration of electronics to include virtual aids to navigation. Particular relevance to recreational boaters is the deployment of virtual buoys, wherein the buoy has no physical presence and instead is transmitted by the Coast Guard. There are cost issues as not every recreational boater has/will have an AIS transponder, for example. There are both technical and human factors aspects to this and one question is how this will impact accident rates.
  - Drone craft: what sort of navigation rules do they have to observe? Dan serves as NBSAC’s liaison to NAVSAC, and he suggested ERAC also be aware of relevant issues surfacing in their discussions.

#### Evaluating and feeding the ERAC triage process (discussed by Tammy Terry)

- The ERAC Triage Team was set by the procedure developed in 2014; it consists of the ERAC Chair (Tammy), Vice Chair (Glenn Moates), Board Liaison to ERAC (Cody Jones), and two at-large ERAC members (Dan Maxim and Eric Lundin); additionally, Dick Snyder serves as a team resource.
- **Any committee member who has an idea/topic/issue they think should be submitted (whether self-generated or received from other sources), ideally should post the submission to the Lighthouse Discussion Forum on Connect [<http://tinyurl.com/g5dg5wp>].** In lieu of that, contact one of the team members to make sure it gets into the queue.
- **The team’s last call was in late January; another should be scheduled by the end of June.**

### **Capturing ERAC’s contribution to NASBLA’s Most Wanted List** (discussion led by Tammy Terry)

- NASBLA is developing a “Most Wanted List” (MWL) of recreational boating safety improvements patterned after a list produced by NTSB (see [2015 NTSB list](#)).
  - On the NTSB list, sometimes there are statistics associated with the item, sometimes not; one commonality, though, is that there is always a “why?” as to its inclusion.
- The MWL was discussed at a session during the March 2015 BLA workshop; the result was a [starter list](#) of possible items for inclusion. [As John Johnson later described for the group, this is an effort to further identify the states’ priorities and draw attention to them. The March discussion was just a first pass at this; more work needs to be done to define the issues, and NASBLA would appreciate any input on criteria that might be used to develop future priorities.]
- For today’s meeting, and especially the afternoon breakouts, attendees were asked to consider:
  - Are there topics that have not been included in the starter list that you think should be?
  - Are there topics already in the starter list that you think should be in the top ten? If you have access to or know of factual information for the “why?” then also provide that.

### **A walk-through of the NASBLA Lighthouse** (led by Tammy Terry and Deb Gona)

- As part of the walk-through, and in preparation for the charge breakouts, Tammy asked members to think about potential uses for the Lighthouse (e.g., to attract a broader audience to their work and product(s); to alert about upcoming products via the “On the Horizon” portal; etc.); and especially to consider how to increase both initial and repeat traffic to the site.
- For audio accompanying the walk-through of the Lighthouse, go to the file “ERAC May 12 3 Triage MWL LH session.mp3” in the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** section of NASBLA’s Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/5486330/files> (11:55 to 56:00 minute mark).
- Some take-away’s from this session:
  - The Lighthouse is a committee effort, member-driven. Think about/send along content (especially for pages like “On the Horizon”); currently, Deb modifies the webpages;
  - At minimum, all ERAC members should join the Lighthouse community on Connect to access discussions and the library; unlike the case for webpages, any community member can post to the discussions and add to the library holdings, per the guidance and instructions posted to the site;
  - The Discussion Forum component on Connect is critical to building the virtual Lighthouse community; that virtual community **must** be bigger than just ERAC;
  - Members of the RBS community (writ large) and who already have NASBLA log-ins can enter Connect and join the Lighthouse community; non-NASBLA members, who do not currently have log-ins, can have an ID created and enter as a guest;
- **Additional assignments, for consideration in charge breakout discussions and beyond:**
  - Use the webpages and the discussion forum/library; then give feedback on what you like and don’t like;

- Generate content ideas—Are there reports, documents, etc., that should be in the library? What about forum discussion topics? Anything stemming from the charge work? What events, other upcoming activities should be posted to On the Horizon?
- What can/should we do to recruit/attract new users to the site and retain users?
- More broadly speaking, how can we distill complex information to attract users?
- How can we make good use of **Currents**, NASBLA’s weekly email newsletter (e.g., to alert users to new information on the Lighthouse or to provide basic information about the outcome(s) of a charge...remember that a “product” does not always mean producing a huge report).

### **Charge breakout reports – in order of presentation (See Appendix A for more notes from breakout sessions)**

#### **B3 Statistical Report Template and C2 Human Factors (reminders from Tammy Terry)**

- Changes in the agenda to allow more breakout time for individual charges led to collapsing an afternoon time slot originally intended for full committee discussion and feedback on these two charges. However, since most of the content and needs associated with both charges were adequately covered in the morning **Roundtable**, **Tammy offered two reminders to attendees regarding B3 and C2** before proceeding with the other charge breakout reports:
  - First, if any ERAC member still has (or knows someone who has) comments on the B3 working document, send feedback to Glenn Moates and Paul Newman, preferably by close of the week. Otherwise, the team should wrap up work for delivery to the USCG.
  - Second, if any member is aware of other states that might be recruited for the C2 human factors pilot—or if the member state is interested in participating—contact Glenn Moates and Dan Maxim.

#### **C1 NRBS priority research (reported by Tammy Terry)**

- The team had already identified three major tasks (as described in the **Roundtable**, pp. 7-8):
  - To finalize the draft report (or reports, if separated into two parts) on rate normalization and on other potential indicators associated with exposure hours. Tammy noted the good input from the Coast Guard representatives during the breakout and said that work would be done toward making the information more understandable and more meaningful to readers. Target date for completing revised draft: June 1.
  - On the analysis of the fatality victim’s residence vs. accident location and effect on a state’s fatality rate, the intent remains to wrap up that work by July 1. The team still needs to confirm Susan Weber’s availability to run all states’ numbers for its review.
  - On the comparison of the other, similar surveys conducted in the same timeframe as the 2012 NRBS, Tammy noted that target completion would be mid-July.
- Regarding other products beyond reports:

- Development of an annual conference session is a possibility, dependent on timely construction of a set of “did you know?” questions and answers arising from the work.
- The Lighthouse would also serve to showcase such “did you know?” Q&A.
- Regarding measures of effectiveness and uniformity:
  - The team generally agreed that the short term measures already identified (re posting five key findings or “did you know’s?” in various formats, such as the Lighthouse and Currents) were appropriate.
  - The long range measures (for enhanced, practical understanding of the NRBS findings’ implications and for input to the Coast Guard) would be retained, with a minor modification to the second one so as *not* to give the perception that ERAC is “directing” the Coast Guard to make changes to the survey based on the committee’s input.
- Regarding an addition to consideration in development of the “most wanted” list:
  - State-level valid and realistic exposure hours

#### **E series charges** (reported by Joe McCullough)

- Joe reported that the team had a “lively” discussion, especially on flotation issues, and that they identified additional topics for consideration, including engine/boat fires and expired flares.
- For the E1 exploratory charge, the team described the immediate task and a potential product:
  - Conduct the survey to determine states’ interest: the team identified what should be in the survey of the states (via the BLAs), to include a quick overview of why ERAC is conducting the survey; a list of the topics identified thus far; a request for prioritization and comments (as applicable) on them; a request for further input on the topics (i.e., do they have information on the issue? sources? data or anecdotal evidence? programs to address them? [*team would like to determine local vs. national scope of the identified issues*]); request to determine whether the BLA/state would like to be involved in the continuing work on the topic(s), and to what extent they would like to be involved. [Anticipated timeline: release survey by June 1 (with return by June 15) or in advance of the potential survey to the BLAs on the NASBLA “most wanted” list, whichever comes first; reminder also to briefly update the NBSAC BAE subcommittee (end of May) on the status of the work.]
  - A potential conference session: Joe described the possibility of developing a breakout session on flare disposal, but agreed with a suggestion from Tammy that the proposal indicate that if there is insufficient information or findings to assemble a session on that topic alone, then perhaps a session could involve a combination of equipment and engineering issues resulting from the survey and continuing exploration of topics. [Amy Rigby said there is an employee in her (CA) department who has done much research into flare disposal, and she will put her in contact with Joe.]
- Regarding additions for consideration in development of the “most wanted” list:
  - Flotation issues.

- Disposal of flares and pyrotechnics. [Dan Maxim noted that the Coast Guard has been doing work to identify alternatives to pyrotechnics in the form of signals emitted by electronic devices.]
- Regarding measures of effectiveness and uniformity:
  - At this time, it is difficult to identify measures because of the exploratory nature of the charge; however, an initial output measure might be at least half of the states responding to the planned survey.
- Regarding an item that was posted for consideration to triage, but that is likely to be a piece of the initial E2 examination of data on flotation issues associated with canoes and kayaks, Tammy noted the following member submission: “Include on BARD info and state report forms: Does the involved paddlesport craft have incorporated positive flotation material in construction?”
- Finally, regarding the E1 exploratory charge and how future iterations might work:
  - Although the original submission to the triage process suggested creating a subcommittee within ERAC to focus on these issues, the triage team had recommended a delay in determining structure until the 2015 exploration had time to play out. Joe said that this was discussed and that as of now, he does not think that a new, separate structure within ERAC would be necessary; instead, he suggested that a liaison serve the role of primary gatherer of information and reports from the various ERAC (and other) representatives associated with agencies, organizations, and other bodies working on topics in this broad area. The liaison also would be in a position to more readily identify content connections between the work and activities of the various groups.

#### **B4 accident report narratives** (reported by Tammy Terry)

- The team identified the main tasks (products) to accomplish:
  - For the BAR and state-level BAR forms, develop an explanation/description as to what should be put in the narrative box [Target date: June 1].
  - Develop a general instructional, either as a document or module; articulate the essential elements (“good” and “bad” narratives) [Content target date: July 1].
  - Develop best practices for incorporating instructional details into state policy/manuals. [Target date: June 1].
  - Pass the work along to—Enforcement & Training Committee, for the best way to deliver the information; and Gary Haupt, for eventual incorporation into the Boating Accident Investigation training [Target for relaying the information: by annual conference].
- The team does not anticipate any conference presentations this year.
- Regarding measures of effectiveness and uniformity:
  - The team would like to go back to Richard Moore as the original submitter of the charge and find out what he thinks would be a good measure of effectiveness; beyond that, the team expressed interest in a count of how many states eventually incorporate the practices, and potentially, a measure based on the number of rejected narratives (is that a viable way to measure “success”?).

### **B5 documenting alcohol/drug involvement** (reported by Tammy Terry)

- The team set aside the drug involvement portion of this charge for further discussion on its next teleconference (date TBD).
- However, the team did discuss the alcohol-related portion and identified the following:
  - First, limit the initial work on this charge to fatalities;
  - Second, explore potential for creating *objective* standards that might be used to identify when there is lower involvement (i.e., not at the clinical / legal level and not defined as a contributing factor). This was considered as a result of discussing California’s standard practice (based on NTSB work) of using a .035 BAC as the lower threshold (for involvement).
    - This would potentially create three levels – legal level (contributing factor); alcohol “involvement” as the range from the lower threshold to the legal; and no involvement at all.
- The team will review NTSB documentation identified by Dan Maxim and posted to Basecamp in the B5 area at <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/12735822/posts/92952421/comments>
- No firm timeline was set for these steps; the group would like to go back to the original charge submitter, Richard Moore, with these initial thoughts.
- No conference presentations on this topic for this year.
- Regarding a measure of uniformity, the preliminary thought is to identify how many states use the guidance; for a measure of effectiveness, the intent is to collect better data.
- Regarding considerations in development of the “most wanted” list:
  - Add “more accurate and reliable data on alcohol involvement in boating accidents”
  - Corroborate interest in the entry regarding “addressing distracted boaters”

### **A3 ESD issues/guidance** (reported by Eric Lundin)

- Work will continue toward identifying resources to include in the library on the Lighthouse [of note: the items posted to the meeting materials webpage will continue to be available for download from that site during this cycle]
- Regarding two products under development (with intent to wrap up by mid-June):
  - The draft checklist for investigators: all team members (and other interested committee members not on the team) should review the document posted to the meeting materials page (in “drafts for discussion” zip folder); George Birdwell, TN, who participated in the breakout discussion also will be reviewing the draft. All comments from the team and committee at-large should be forwarded to Eric;
  - The draft “legislative guidance” piece: all team members (and other interested committee members) should review the document posted to the meeting materials page (in “drafts for discussion” zip folder); there was good feedback during the discussion; George Birdwell also will be reviewing this draft. All comments from the team and committee at-large should be forwarded to Eric.
- No measures of effectiveness or uniformity were identified by the team at this time.

- No conference session presentation was identified; however if there is any session involving the Lighthouse, the team would want mention regarding (anticipated) ESD-related resources.
- Regarding considerations in the development of the “most wanted” list: Raise awareness on ESD, both from the public’s and officers’ perspectives.

## Wrap up

- Review of posters around the room—with post it notes—covering committee members’ ideas for the Lighthouse, the Most Wanted List, Triage ideas, and a general “parking lot” for ERAC issues.
- **For consideration in the Lighthouse:**
  - Make sure the “did you know’s?” generated from work on the National Recreational Boating Survey are added to that Get Equipped subpage;
  - On the Get Equipped portal, possibly using the left-hand navigation column, incorporate links pertinent to law enforcement officers or investigators for gathering information. For example: NOAA website to look up vessel documentation numbers; Coast Guard VIS, Boating Safety Division, map center; for border areas, Canadian Transport Agency/Vessel search; and so on.
- **For consideration/discussion on the Most Wanted List** (some already identified in the charge breakout reports):
  - Subordinate to the number one issue on the starter list re mandatory life jacket wear, and regarding canoes and kayaks – break through the barriers to compliance with life jacket wear
    - In further consideration of this topic, a suggestion was made to reword the original entry re mandatory life jacket wear to “investigate feasibility of mandatory life jacket wear”; in follow-up discussion, it was noted that the Most Wanted List is really focused on things that NASBLA as an association and its members can do; and that perhaps an investigation of the feasibility suggests “pre-MWL” (i.e., before it would get on the list). Perhaps the item should be “increase life jacket wear.”];
  - State-level valid and reliable exposure hours;
  - More accurate and reliable data on alcohol involvement in boating fatalities;
  - Develop resources and guidelines for safe disposal of flares and pyrotechnics;
  - Starter list shows an entry for SUPs – consider modifying to “Paddlesport issues – education/training issues” (to help cover paddlecraft flotation issues) or to encompassing with the larger Paddlesports –fatalities entries;
  - Raise awareness of electric shock drownings (ESDs) among officers and the public.
  - In further discussion on these potential entries—and in particular, those on paddlesports--the point was made regarding the importance of all parties starting with the same level of information and basic, consistent data (i.e., working from the same set of “facts”); whether through the efforts of the newly-created Ad Hoc Committee on

Paddlesports or some other mechanism, the suggestion is that there be a fact book, of sorts, centered on safety issues, that would be relevant to decision making in this area.

- **For potential Triage ideas** (one already identified in previous reports):
  - Virtual aids to navigation
  - Develop model act for “new” life jacket laws (rationale: most states will be out of date when labeling changes); work with Enforcement & Training and Education committees [side note: check language on existing NASBLA model act]
- **Potential conference presentation topics** (already identified in charge breakout reports):
  - NRBS “did you know’s?”
  - Engineering issues/flare disposal
  - Lighthouse [ultimately dropped from the list as a session—on its own--would be highly dependent on increased interaction on the site and forum; an alternate suggestion is to use Currents to get users to the site and into the discussions]
- **General ERAC “parking lot”:**
  - Member requested consideration of allowing law enforcement officers and investigators access to ABYC standards; this would be limited to those who have completed Level 1 and 2 coursework (perhaps through Basecamp sign-in). Work with ABYC to determine feasibility.
- Before adjournment, Tammy Terry asked members in person or on the phone for feedback on the meeting content and discussions. Deb Gona also gathered perspectives and feedback from members on the general timing and location of the meeting, especially after having to reschedule it from March and in light of recent years’ weather events.

Having no other business to address, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

## Appendix A -- Charge breakout sessions

Audio files for the breakout sessions were posted May 13, 2015, to the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** section of NASBLA's Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/5486330/files>

### Breakout sessions

ERAC May 12 4a A3 ESD breakout (length 31:49; 3.7 MB)

ERAC May 12 4b C1 NRBS breakout (length 50:28; 5.9 MB)

ERAC May 12 5a B4 B5 charges breakout (length 1:07:44; 7.9 MB)

ERAC May 12 5b E charges breakout (length 1:12:43; 8.5 MB)

Following are additional discussion or decision points from each session. They are only intended to assist the teams in recalling discussion items that were not detailed in the report outs during the full meeting. They are not intended as proceedings or transcripts of the conversations.

### A3 ESD issues/guidance:

- See the ERAC May 12 meeting materials page (and now, the A3 project area of Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/11688703/posts/92956165/comments>) for three zip folders containing additional resources (beyond those that had already been posted to Basecamp), relevant state legislative activity (TN, WV, and KY), and drafts for team discussion.
- Question was posed as to how many such incidents occur per year. Discussion was around the fact that the incidents may be reported as “drownings” with no indication of them being ESD events; the difficulty is that the presence of electricity in the water may come and go depending on what’s going on with/in the boat (e.g., equipment cycling on and off). It could be an ESD event, but then the current disappears.
- One purpose of the charge (in order to aid in getting these events reported) is to provide resources to the officers / investigators so they can recognize and then accurately report ESD events. See especially, the file “ESD Response\_Investigation Checklist\_EL\_TT\_draft for review” in the zip folder marked “A3 Drafts for discussion.”
- Question was posed as to whether the charge should help to identify the local resources or at minimum the criteria for/type of expert that could be consulted in the case of a suspected event. For example, it was noted that Tennessee has consulted a marine electrician who is knowledgeable about the issue and has been called upon to investigate two incidents.
- One member said that they see the charge as a problem and as an educational opportunity (similar to the revelation that carbon monoxide incidents could occur in an open atmosphere). The educational aspect is that whenever there is a drowning, you need to look around and determine whether there is any electricity anywhere near the site of the incident. Question is, though, how do you capture information on those incidents where a marine officer may not even be involved (in incidents where the event would not be a reportable boating accident)?
- Team discussed where the resources (documents and links on ESD) and other tools (such as the checklist, guidance, etc.) should be housed; consensus was that they should be included as part of the NASBLA Lighthouse. [Of note, another resource, identified as a result of a recent presentation, is Molly Hall of SafeElectricity.org.]
- Regarding a quick review of the draft “legislative guidance” piece (See file “Legislative Guidance Piece\_TTerry initial thoughts\_for review” in the zip folder A3 Drafts for discussion), the initial reaction was favorable. However, suggestion was that the revision should incorporate some bullet points (e.g., key provisions from reviewing enacted legislation) that could be considered in

drafting legislation on ESDs. The product would not take the model act route, but rather serve to identify important elements. [Tennessee’s legislative experience, as an example, was described as having started with several higher goals in mind including, among other things, a certain level of inspection and of mandated protection; but the final legislative action resulted in something less than the original goals. Members discussed that the bullet points offered in the ERAC product should reflect higher goals.]

#### **C1 NRBS priority research:**

- Dan Maxim walked the team through the draft report, [A Discussion of Recreational Boating Fatality Statistics and Rate Normalization](#), made up of two sections (the second section being exploratory data analysis). For the audio file, to follow along with the draft, go to the **ERAC 2015 Overall Activity** on Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/5486330/files> and look for “ERAC May 12 4b C1 NRBS breakout.mp3.” (01:59 to 26:00 minute mark) The entire team should have an opportunity to review the draft and make comments.
- Dan suggested that an additional step—to help put exposure-based fatality rates into context—is to create a “risk ladder,” wherein each rung represents a different level of risk by a particular factor. This “risk ladder” is under development.
- In follow up to Dan’s presentation of the draft, and in response to questions posed by Tammy Terry, there was candid and productive discussion regarding the extent to which analyses like this are useful (or not) to the Coast Guard’s efforts; ERAC’s interest in fostering better understanding about the survey (notably, among state users [e.g., regarding state-to-state differences]); and going forward, what the team might consider doing to more readily and simply explain and communicate complex information resulting from this charge—and other ERAC work—to the BLAs and broader RBS community.
- A second component of the charge—analysis of where the victims resided vs. where their accident occurred and the impact on the calculation of casualty rates (re the numerator)—was only briefly discussed in the time remaining. The hope is to get a complete set of calculations for each state (five-year period) to do the analyses; although initial work began with individual team members pulling their own data, the team will consult with Susan Weber to find out if she can pull the numbers for all states.

#### **B4 accident report narratives and B5 documenting alcohol/drug involvement:**

- The team reviewed and discussed work already done on the B4 Essential Elements of a Narrative Writeboard on Basecamp at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/W5977219>, and made some additions and clarifications (so noted on the Writeboard):

From May 12 Meeting:

- Officers don’t realize that supporting documentation (forms, etc.) are not incorporated into narrative in BARD
- If HFACS-Lite is incorporated; or even in the meantime before it becomes “active”, incorporate issues related to human factors involved in the accident
- Explain details of injury (location and severity) in narrative to correlate with checkboxes

- All team members should review the already-posted “good” and “bad” narrative examples at <https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/12735815/files>, and determine whether anything more can be gleaned from them as additions to the essential elements.
- The discussion led the group to consider that incorporation of this content into the current reference and resource modules might not be the best or only delivery format and product for

this charge. Instead, multiple tasks and delivery formats and targets were identified (see **Charge breakout report**, p. 14 of this summary). The largest piece to be developed—a general instructional may need to be broad enough to cover the range of personnel that touch the narrative (from the operator writing the report to the person who enters the narrative into BARD; they may or may not be one and the same).

- In the case of the B4 (and B5) charges (per the recommendations made during the triage process), the intention is for ERAC to complete work on content and identify the potential components and possible format; incorporation into final form and format, however, will be pending coordination with NASBLA’s Enforcement & Training Committee.
- The remainder of the breakout discussion was centered on the B5 charge [39:24 minute mark to end of audio]
- Initial discussion was regarding differences between the information captured by the participant member states and where and how, on their forms, it is captured.
- As a next step for the team--review the boating accident forms received to date to “categorize” the information collected.
- See **Charge breakout report**, p. 15, for articulation of the group’s agreement to begin the work by focusing on fatal accidents (where there is *more likely* to be a BAC, though there are still inconsistencies) and to examine the possibility of creating an objective standard (e.g., California’s standard practice for using a .035 BAC threshold for involvement; .08 is their legal). Team would like to receive the California study (based on NTSB study) referenced during the discussion; the NTSB-related work was identified during session and has been posted to Basecamp in the B5 section.
- Also, the team indicated interest not just in the operator’s circumstances, but also other boat occupants.
- The group posed the question of whether anything objective can be measured regarding the drug involvement portion of this charge, but deferred further examination of the drug-related issues to future calls.

#### **E series charges:**

- The discussion began with a brief recap of ERAC’s previous involvement in engineering issues and how the committee gravitated away from the area for various reasons—e.g., not at the same level of interest as some other issues; not a lot of topics to discuss or develop charges on.
- The original submission for this charge indicated creating a subcommittee to handle the topics; there was some resistance to considering that until the issues could be explored.
- The ‘rethinking’ (even on the part of the original submitter, per Joe McCullough) suggests that there is not a need for a separate group, but instead, perhaps, a point of contact (with relationships better defined)—between ERAC and the other entities (e.g., good, key connections, such as Pete Chisholm and Dave Marlow, can be tapped).
- The purpose would be to aid in the process of determining whether or not ERAC should go after particular engineering/equipment issues.
- Joe tasked himself with taking the role initially, and suggested developing a ‘desk manual’ to ensure that whoever is in that role can manage the process and maintain the contacts.
- The team discussed that the leadership in this role should be maintained with a state member.
- To that end, the team also discussed the need to scan the states via a survey of the BLAs to determine state interests and concerns on these topics. It will be important to gauge whether they are they even interested in/concerned about the topics. There was consensus that in the survey, example topics should be given, but that the respondents should be asked to reach

beyond those to identify others, as possible [see other components described in the **Charge breakout reports**, pp. 13-14].

- Participants also had a lengthy discussion as background to the E2 charge regarding basic flotation issues associated with canoes and kayaks; including current extent of coverage of federal regulations regarding level flotation (for under 20 feet, and specifically targeting outboards); are there any other manufacturing associations other than NMMA that cover the paddlecraft (in order to gather information)?; what are the opportunities to educate regarding the variety of vessels and what happens with each type?

## **Appendix B – Meeting Agenda (begins next page)**

**NASBLA ENGINEERING, REPORTING AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE (ERAC) MEETING  
TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2015**

**Meeting Site: NASBLA Headquarters Training Room**  
1648 McGrathiana Parkway, Suite 360, Lexington, KY 40511 (859.225.9487)

-----

**PRELIMINARY AGENDA**

**All times shown are EST and subject to adjustment**

**8:00 a.m. EST Call to order / introductions / agenda overview-modifications as needed / housekeeping items**

**Setting the stage – things to know and keep in mind during the day ... and the rest of the year**

- *What's going on around us? How do we fit in? What might affect our work? What can we contribute?*
- *Measuring the effectiveness of our efforts*
- *Recent charge accomplishments and impacts*

**8:45 a.m. EST ROUNDTABLE: A “round the table and phone line” five-minute overview of each of ERAC’s 2014-15 standing, carryover & new charges, and important initiatives of partners within and beyond NASBLA**

ERAC charge team leader(s) or their designees will take about **5 minutes** to describe what their charge is about, the progress to date, what still needs to be done, and what needs to be accomplished before day’s end in breakouts or full committee discussion.

Partner representatives within and beyond the NASBLA organization are invited to spend **5-7 minutes** updating the committee on projects, issues and events of mutual interest.

**9:30 a.m. EST Break (15 minutes)**

**9:45 a.m. EST ROUNDTABLE resumes**

**10:30 a.m. EST Break (15 minutes)**

**10:45 a.m. EST Evaluating and feeding the ERAC Triage process**—Five new charges resulted from the first triage of proposals submitted during the general solicitation of charge ideas. How did it work? How will we seek out / receive other new and emerging issues throughout the year? Will something emerge from breakout work this afternoon for submission to the next round?

**Capturing ERAC’s “most wanted”**—NASBLA is developing a Most Wanted List of Recreational Boating Safety Improvements patterned after a list produced by NTSB. Weigh in on topics already identified, give input on the “most critical” based on data and relative impact, and offer suggestions for additions. We’ll address this initiative again before the end of the day.

**The NASBLA Lighthouse: it’s not just a concept anymore**—We’ll tour the webpages that make up the Lighthouse on the main NASBLA website, and stop over at the Lighthouse community and

library on Connect. This cycle, how can we best use this tool to promote ERAC's other projects, inform our work, and build community?

**Noon EST BUFFET (working lunch)**

**12:45 p.m. EST Small group and full committee discussions on select charges (time allotments subject to change based on charge team needs)**

**Note:** Given some crossover between team membership and aspects of certain charge topics, for small group discussions, teams should be proximate to each other to allow merger, as needed.

**Note:** The 3:45 p.m. report out on the discussions should cover: 1) anticipated product(s) to result from this year's work, including any proposals for annual conference sessions; 2) team's realistic plans and expectations for what can be accomplished between now and September (including identification of action steps and tentative timelines / possible milestones); 3) potential measures of effectiveness or uniformity; 4) identification of anything that rises to the level of consideration for the "most wanted" list of safety improvements.

**12:45 p.m. EST** Small group discussions:

- *Electric Shock Drowning (ESD) issues and guidance (Charge A-3)*
- *National Recreational Boating Survey Priority Research (Charge C-1)*

**1:45 p.m. EST** Small group discussions:

- *Quality of Accident Report Narratives (Charge B-4) and Documenting Alcohol/Drug Involvement in Accidents (Charge B-5)*
- *Scope/Nature of Engineering and Equipment Related Issues (Charge E-1), Basic Flotation Issues re Canoes/Kayaks (Charge E-2), and Data on Vessel Theft-Related Issues (Charge E-3)*

**2:45 p.m. EST** Full committee discussion/feedback on *Statistical Report Template (Charge B-3)* and *Human Factors-Applying Best Practices for Gathering/Examining Data (Charge C-2)*

**3:30 p.m. EST Break (15 minutes)**

**3:45 p.m. EST Wrapping up the day's work**

Report out on the small group discussions. Getting agreement on next steps; setting timelines for post-meeting decision-making on charge work and product delivery to NASBLA Executive Board and NASBLA membership. Recap of potential topics for the Triage process, NASBLA Most Wanted List, Lighthouse, and general ERAC improvements.

**4:30 p.m. EST Other business**

**5:00 p.m. EST Adjourn**