

**NASBLA ENGINEERING, REPORTING AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE (ERAC)**  
**FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 2023 — MEETING of the FULL COMMITTEE**  
**Lexington Marriott City Center – Lexington A – 8:15a-2:33p**  
**121 West Vine Street, Lexington, KY**

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

**Session Recordings:**

**GoToMeeting Links (video, .mp4) –**

Morning –

<https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/abd38d7a97b2482e38a6bea1b7a69c76d131747a6f8ad8c94f1fcd2d678dc649>

Afternoon –

<https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/1f2b15dc6b49947b57bc1c9d0b694f38e17b7a3d3ebb0cba1a29aa122ae9d04d>

**Three audio-only files (.mp3) --**

Two covering the morning session and one from the afternoon -- uploaded to Basecamp Tues., March 7 at:

<https://nasbla.basecampHQ.com/projects/5486330-erac-2022-2023-overall-activity/files>

**Attendance:** (attended all or a portion of meeting; \* = remote)

**Members:** Seth Wagner, FL (Chair, presiding); Tammy Terry, OH\* (Vice Chair); Joanna Andrade, CA; Bryan Baronet, TX\*; Deb Green, OH\*; Paul Littman, NY; Matt Majors, TN (and NASBLA BII training); Samm Teixeira, CA\*; Susan Weber, USCG\*; Jonathan Hsieh, USCG\*; Pete Chisholm, Mercury Marine\*; Brian Goodwin, ABYC\*; Ron Sarver, NASBLA (honorary ERAC member)

**Guests:** Zach Mundy (CA)\*; Andrew Iraola, USCG\*; Rachel Warner, USCG\*; Mark Chanski, NASBLA

**NASBLA Leadership:** Susan Stocker, IA (NASBLA Chair); Joe McCullough, AK (NASBLA Vice Chair and newly-assigned board liaison to ERAC); John Johnson, NASBLA CEO

**ERAC staff:** Deborah Gona

**MEETING RECAP – KEY TOPICS, DISCUSSIONS AND ACTION ITEMS**

[See the end of this recap for copies of the Charge Team lists,](#)  
[and an excerpt of Contributing Factors’ Distractions referenced during the meeting.](#)

[Other items referenced are available via live links throughout this recap—to webpages,](#)  
[Basecamp project areas or directly to documents for viewing/downloading.](#)

**Leadership Updates**

- This marked Seth Wagner’s last meeting as ERAC Chair. Effective end of day, he was set to retire from his position with Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission; in mid-March, he will be joining the Coast Guard Boating Safety Division (CG-BSX-21) in the State Program Coordinator slot previously held by Joe Carro. Seth did not know if he would be assigned to join current BSX personnel as a representative to ERAC.
- Vice Chair Tammy Terry will take over as ERAC Chair beyond this meeting. A Vice Chair will be identified.
- Executive Board Vice Chair (and former ERAC member) Joe McCullough has been assigned to serve as ERAC’s board liaison; he replaces Brian Bowles who recently moved to a different role in Nevada state government.

**Committee Operations**

- Recommendations for substantial changes to the charges assigned to ERAC will go to the Executive Board for review and approval. Examples include recommendations to delete (or add) a charge for the current cycle or to significantly narrow a charge’s focus and scope of work.
- See the [Committee Calendar](#) (posted to the [Meeting Materials](#) page) for important tasks and due dates.

## News from the State RBS Workshop on ERAC-related Topics

- **Presentations on the [policy letter](#) and [committee](#):** Deb Gona and Seth presented on CG-BSX 23-01 and the ERAC briefing, respectively. Neither presentation generated feedback or questions. These were not the only workshop sessions with a low level of attendee engagement. Overall, at the workshop, the audience was quieter and, as has been the trend, many attendees also were relatively new to their positions. Per Ron Sarver, 31 of the attending BLAs came into their roles less than four years ago. That said, **the workshop experience just highlighted the need to be aware of and responsive to the diverse audiences who will be most affected by the policy changes and to get the information out multiple times, in multiple ways and formats in which they are most likely to pay attention.**
- **Interactive survey on reporting system:** Executive Board member Curt Lewis, BLA IL (and now lead on the task force originally headed by Brian Bowles) conducted a survey of attendees on-site to help inform the task force's current efforts toward determining whether a state-based recreational boating incident reporting system is of sufficient interest, could realistically be developed, and would actually be used by the states. *[Post-meeting notes from D Gona: During the ERAC meeting, I relayed my notes on the results, but later pulled the survey screen shots (thanks to Hannah Helsby) and assembled them into a [PDF](#) now posted on Basecamp at the [ERAC Overall Activity Files](#) tab.]*
- **[Investigative Training for Boating Incidents](#) – Standard:** Matt Majors updated attendees on what was originally released last fall as a NASBLA Standard (developed through a USCG non-profit grant) and is currently undergoing review by (NASBLA's) National Standards Panel for possible acceptance as an ANSI National Standard. Deb submitted comments prior to the 2/23/23 deadline to incorporate aspects of CG-BSX 23-01 re certain terms' references and update fire/explosion situations. The panel will vet the comments and, if accepted and incorporated, the affected sections will go back out for a 90-day public comment period.

### Key Points about the Current Charges—see end of this recap for charge team lists

*(Follow-up from D Gona: there are excellent discussions interwoven in the charge coverage during the morning session –strongly encourage a listen from 0:22:04 – 2:00:48)*

- **[IR&A 2023 cycle -Extension - Phase 1-Incident Reporting](#)**
  - This remains a standing charge—primarily kept on the books to account for any follow-up on policy and regulatory activities associated with the Recreational Boating Incident Reporting Policy Project recommendations (2020). Committee members will weigh in as-needed.
- **[IR&A 2023-1 Best Practices Development \(Incident Reporting\)](#)**
  - This charge had been led by John Girvalakis (BLA MA), who had to step away from ERAC this cycle due to in-state workload. Some progress had been made “around the edges” while awaiting formal response from the Coast Guard on the project recommendations. See the [Meeting Materials](#) page for a copy of the [working document](#) from the last cycle.
  - With release of the policy letter, Seth emphasized that team work should be directed toward developing targeted tools (instructions, guidance) for the states and especially for use by the officers/investigators in the field.
- **[IR&A 2023-2 Reporting System Redesign \(Incident Reporting\)](#)**
  - This charge will be more “monitoring” for time being as the Coast Guard works through the process of revamping BARD (and as the abovementioned task force continues investigating the possible development of a state-based system). *[Post-meeting notes from D Gona: implementation of CG-BSX 23-01 will require changes to the CG BAR form and BARD. For the former, the data collection and form changes must be announced through a Federal Register Notice and receive OMB approval; ERAC will monitor that effort and NASBLA will submit comments – and advise the states to comment in kind – when that occurs.]*

- **IR&A 2023-3 Human Factors: Refine Data Collection/Analysis** *(Follow-up from D Gona: strongly encourage a listen to this segment of the morning session 0:29:30 to 1:11:34)*
  - Seth, who had been spearheading this charge and collection of distraction-related information on Florida incidents, strongly encouraged ERAC to **get more states beyond Florida involved** in collecting this data that can help to better define contributors (notably, inattention). Having more (and more diverse) states engaged would paint a bigger and perhaps increasingly accurate or valid picture of what is going on in the realm of human factors.
  - As an aside, the study of human factors has gained more attention from NBSAC (evidenced by a [task statement assigned to its Prevention through People subcommittee](#)) and is an activity in the [National RBS Strategic Plan 2022-2026](#) (Activity 3.2.3 Develop and implement improved methods for studying human factors in recreational boating incidents).
  - Seth shared a spreadsheet (see [visibility/distractions](#) document on the [Meeting Materials](#) page) covering incidents from 2022. He noted that while investigators initially used the distraction codes for fatalities and serious injuries only, they had recently begun using it for all incidents as it was not a great impact to ask one or two extra questions (in Florida, the data is collected in the operator section via drop-down menu). He noted a by-product of the collection has been a higher success rate regarding citations since the recording of distractions breaks down further why the operator is being cited for NavRule violations or careless reckless operations.
  - The previously-mentioned standard -- [Investigative Training for Boating Incidents](#) -- includes a list of distractions [pages 12-13] in the Human Factors section. For it, the BII coursework, and further data collections, ERAC should work to ensure that everyone is on the same page, with clear descriptions as to what falls into each category. *[Follow-up from D Gona—at the end of this recap, see the full list of distraction codes and descriptions associated with the proposed revision to the contributing factor Improper Lookout/Inattention.]*
  - The original human factors supplemental forms—the lengthy versions with guidance—can be found on the [Human Performance page](#) in the Lighthouse Get Equipped section.
  - Representatives from two states at the meeting indicated interest in exploring the collection of distraction data: Joanna Andrade will review California’s regulations to determine if additional items could be incorporated onto the LE form; and Tammy Terry and Deb Green will float the idea with investigators to see if there is a possibility of piloting the collection in Ohio. The Florida collection is expected to continue with Nick Korade ([nicholas.korade@myFWC.com](mailto:nicholas.korade@myFWC.com)).
- **K&CM 2023-1 Lighthouse Reevaluation - Develop ERAC Product Placement/ Marketing Plan**
  - Joanna Andrade will be taking the lead on this charge, which had been set aside last cycle in favor of other priority activities. She will consult with Ron Sarver for updates on how the website is being used and on NASBLA’s additional capabilities, and then pull the team back together to restart work and determine how the charge description might need to be adjusted.
  - This cycle, the charge team will need to weigh in on the formats/presentations and placement of the products developed in association with the rollout of CG-BSX 23-01 policy letter.
  - Ron highlighted a few of the other information outlets besides the website that ERAC might consider for targeting different audiences—for example, consider NASBLA Weekly or even a newsletter (e.g., NASBLA’s Vessel Identification, Registration and Titling Committee (VIRT) has a quarterly newsletter that goes to all registering/titling personnel in the states).
  - For past documentation, including past call notes and the product inventory compiled in 2020, see Basecamp <https://nasbla.basecamphq.com/projects/6173290-erac-k-cm-2023-1-complete-lighthouse-reevaluation-develop-erac-product-marketing-plan/log>
- **S&R 2023-1 NRBSS —2018 Follow-Up and Input to Upcoming Surveys**
  - Jonathan Hsieh noted that apart from the [two webinars](#) conducted by the charge team in May 2022, the 2018 NRBSS gained some additional traction as to its utility with references in a GAO report

([GAO-23-105729, Recreational Boating: How Vessel Users Contribute to and Benefit from a Federal Trust Fund](#)) and a Washington State report ([Study on Non-Motorized Boating Fatalities in Washington State \(Evans Policy Innovation Collaborative\), released Dec 2022](#)).

- There has been no additional (unsolicited) feedback from the webinars; due to other priority activities, the team did not follow up on the in-webinar polls and no focus groups were conducted.
  - As to status of the next round, CG-BSX is still on the path of seeking OMB approval for the next iteration, and intends to open the vendor competition through a NOFO (issuance of the broader non-profit grant NOFO, which had been delayed pending release of the National RBS Strategic Plan, is taking priority right now). There will be an opportunity for the team and ERAC at-large to offer suggestions for questions to be contained in the survey instruments (including COVID and post-COVID questions tied to behaviors and exposure).
  - Tammy Terry noted that Ohio just did a boater survey (which included exposure); she will share information with the group on the results and a live webinar scheduled for March 21.
  - The charge language *may* need to be adjusted to accommodate the remainder of this cycle; but more significant modifications will likely be needed later (and in the version that will carry into the 2024 committee cycle) as more plans fall into place for the next iteration of surveys).
- **S&R 2023-2 Investigate Factors Associated with Incidents During Pandemic Years** (*Post-meeting note from D Gona: this agenda item stimulated an interesting discussion that included not only the charge topic, but also reactions to the content of a State RBS Workshop session; listen to the morning session: 1:27:40 to 2:00:40*)
    - The primary questions posed about this charge, which had not gotten off the ground in the last cycle due to other priorities, were “is there time and ability to do anything with it or should it be tabled?” and “what is the value?” There was also concern about the currency of the impact and whether things may have just returned to the pre-pandemic timeframe.
    - Ultimately, following the morning discussions, the decision was made to move forward and further define a scope of work. Paul Littman agreed to take the lead on this charge.
    - The conversations around this topic yielded several considerations and surfaced a variety of ideas about its potential value. Andrew Iraola, who had conducted a rental vessel analysis last year (see 2022 State RBS Workshop [video](#) in [Basecamp](#)), suggested that if there is another pandemic (or similar event), the same trends might come into play; as such, it might be worthwhile to investigate as a means of doing some preventative work and identifying messaging that could be employed. Paul also suggested it could be a way to model other disruptions, including those of an economic nature; moreover, it might offer a baseline. Mark Chanski, from an education standpoint, said that with the explosion of new boaters, he would be interested in knowing why they got into trouble and what was causing those incidents; he noted it would otherwise have taken years to gather data on enough new boaters for a sufficient sample to draw any conclusions. Tammy noted that beyond the accident angle, there are likely some lessons learned as to why these new boaters got involved and whether they are staying involved. Deb Green added that it is not just new boaters, but also boaters that returned during the pandemic. Brian Goodwin expressed interest in any contributors associated with the older boats that came into service during the pandemic and which might have led to incidents.

**Rollout of CG-BSX Policy Letter 23-01 Recreational Boating Incident Reporting: Overview of key policy changes; preview of topics to be covered by Susan Weber in March 15 and 20 webinars** (*Post-meeting note from D Gona: For detail, review morning session 2:01:58 to end of recording; reference [slides used by Susan in discussion](#).*)

- Susan used this preview and draft presentation to seek feedback from meeting attendees on the content of policy information contained on the slides and on how the policy changes and their implementation would likely affect them and their states. She asked everyone to think about the impacts on their daily work, the data collection tools they use, their reporting systems, other products they create from their statistics, and educational efforts they will need to rollout.

- **Member questions and comments:** *Post-meeting note from D Gona: The following list is not exhaustive; it does cover significant questions that arose about the meaning or practical application of the policy and particular terms and does hint at the sorts of questions that may arise during the webinar sessions. In some cases, that may mean modifying or clarifying content for the webinars. Other items will likely require additional CG-BSX internal discussions (e.g., about how best to code certain report fields to ensure consistency); several will need best practices developed. For all detail, listen to morning session 2:01:58 to end of recording. Reference to slide numbers is to the PDF of the PPT slides that Susan used. In the notes below, D Gona inserted labels or paragraph numbers from the policy letter for easy reference.*
  - **Regarding the damage threshold (slide 6):** The description of “Damage to the vessel or other property” (paragraph 4h in the policy) sets the framework for what should be included or excluded; however, best practices will need more detail/examples (*D Gona note: some of this has already been detailed from prior work and will need to be pulled forward and reviewed/updated as needed*). For example, from responses to questions posed during the meeting: items like fishing poles, phones or jewelry would be considered personal property and not included, but “personal” property permanently affixed to the boat would likely be. Further, the cost of labor should not be included; however, some state members noted that the labor costs may not necessarily be separated out from the damages total they collect and receive; reality is that some of the data may need to be caveated.
  - **Regarding complete loss (slide 7):** (per paragraph 4h in the policy): Question was if the vessel is worth less than the \$2K threshold and is a “complete loss” is it still reportable? Yes.
  - **Vessel definition (slide 8):** (paragraph 5b(14) in the policy): Question arose with example of a child (toy) version of a PWC, and what its status would be. Suggestion was that there may need to be additional guidance on handling watercraft not on the list and more information in best practices. For the webinar itself, suggestion was to add a qualifier for craft that “haven’t necessarily had a determination done on them yet” and perhaps information on how to get a vessel determination.
  - **Some of the scenarios** and other policy changes that were discussed in some detail:
    - **Collision with fixed object (slide 10):** There were questions about the coding for certain incidents falling in this category and the capture of non-vessel damages (other property). Suggestion was that best practices would need to include instruction / emphasize that a docked vessel is considered part of the infrastructure.
    - **Collision with vessel (slide 11):** This term merges the CG-BAR form “collisions with vessel” fields that currently separate out recreational, commercial, etc. Some attendees noted potential confusion regarding mooring and docking. Suggestion was to consider the use of visuals to help illustrate some of the changes that will need to be made in data recording practices. Also, as noted above, will need to emphasize that when a vessel is tied to a dock, it is an extension of the dock.
    - **Fire/explosion series (slides 12-15):** Coverage of this series led to a lengthy discussion about the increasing use of batteries and related issues, and questions as to how battery-related fires should be coded. Susan indicated she would check with the BSX product assurance branch to get insights as to how the incidents should be coded for the sake of consistency. Suggestion was made that down the road it might be worthwhile to consider batteries as its own category (or drop-down) or at minimum, to capture type or cause in the incident narrative.
    - **Flooding and Swamping (slides 16 and 17):** Currently coded as Flooding/Swamping, but now separated out to get more granularity as to how water is entering the vessel, which has implications for safety and manufacturing.
    - **Natural phenomena (slide 18) –** Question was posed as to whether it includes an injury from the interaction (if it meets the injury threshold). No, unless the incident also meets the other conditions -- vessel underway and another event occurred.
    - **Medical emergencies (slide 22):** The primary change in policy is that another vessel must have been involved (besides the one in which the occupant suffered the emergency) for the



incident to be reportable. The logic is – and as NavRules apply – that the other vessel could have / should have taken action (e.g., to avoid collision). “Sudden medical condition,” a term on the current CG-BAR form does not have a definition in the policy letter and would not be used; however, another term might need to be used to better describe the incident. Bottom line is that there will need to be guidance in best practices for consistent coding.

- **Sole state waters (slide 24):** These waters are not mentioned in the regulatory provisions on jurisdiction. However, they are covered (and subject to the reporting of incidents on them), as a result of a state’s compliance with its USCG RBS agreement for funding.
  - **Re policy letter paragraph 5b(2) on Self Inflicted Injuries:** Concern was raised about the language describing this non-reportable occurrence that could potentially be misleading—notably, regarding the “ingestion of controlled substances” which could include prescription drugs, etc. Best practices will need to clarify this non-reportable and the intent of self-harm.
- In closing the presentation preview, Susan said that the CG-BAR form, the BARD entry screens, query wizards, and so on, will need to change. She asked members to think about the changes their states would need to make and what level of effort would be needed to make the policy changes. Is the 2024 effective date realistic? The discussion picked up in the afternoon.
    - Susan described what must happen with the CG-BAR form at the national level—routing through the CG forms office, privacy office, DHS, Federal Register notices for two public comment periods to solicit feedback and finally routing through OMB for approval. Typically, this would take a year, but experience with the current BAR form approval indicates it could exceed that timeframe.
    - Also at the national level, regarding the BARD system, Susan said they will need to engage other CG offices to get funding aligned, get the current vendor to agree to this ‘optional’ task, and then test and implement. That process could take 3+ months.
    - With NASBLA and the boating incident investigation courses, there would need to be changes to get the course instruction aligned with the policy and revised terms.
    - At the state level, members cited some of the following:
      - In California, primarily getting the instructors up to speed. Getting updates to the form and database might be a concern, but a bigger one would be if there are references that might require regulatory change at the state level. Joanna will be checking.
      - Ohio, as Tammy noted, might be ahead of the curve as they have already been making changes to their systems based on the recommendations.
      - Seth said there would need to be database changes in Florida, and some to the form; they have recently renewed the agreement with their vendor for ongoing maintenance so updates could be accommodated; instruction to the officers/investigators will need to align.
      - Paul said this might be a good thing for NY, which otherwise has been slow to update its methods. Now there will be an actual set of changes that they can design forms and systems to accommodate.
      - Board Chair Susan Stocker, who joined the meeting in the afternoon, said she thought Iowa would be able to accommodate the changes for 2024.

## Other Topics / Updates / Wrap-Up and Thanks to All

- Based on what he heard during the committee briefings at the State RBS Workshop, Seth speculated that as in past years, there would likely be crossover/cooperation between ERAC and other committees on specific activities. Mark Chanski raised the Education & Outreach Committee’s continuing work on the boating education assessment questions and alignment of testing weights with incident report data as one area where he wants to enlist ERAC’s input again.
- Over the last few years, NASBLA (including some ERAC members on the project steering group) has collaborated with the [Safe States Alliance](#) (of state public health agencies) on an “injury surveillance project” funded through a USCG non-profit grant. The second-year report, [Boat Occupant Injury Surveillance](#)

[Roundtable Report – Tier 2](#), was released December 2022; building on the first year’s recommendations, it provides a basis for a state interested in the prevention of passenger injuries through enhanced surveillance to implement suggestions for engaging with the state’s public health network. Ron Sarver said that with the latest grant for a third phase, they are beginning to pilot test those recommendations in Washington State where there has been a strong buy-in from the public health and boating communities.

- **Post-meeting note from D Gona:** For information beyond the written reports, review the recording of the 2022 NASBLA Annual Conference session on [“Improving Surveillance of Non-Fatal Recreational Boating Occupant Injuries: Bringing Boating and Public Health Together,”](#) by project facilitator Amy Schlotthauer.
- Jonathan Hsieh, grant technical manager for the project, added that as part of the tier 2 work, they reached out to the CDC’s National Syndromic Surveillance Program, which has accepted the national definition of a “boating injury” (a computer code used to pull the data and report). He explained that the states’ public health agencies report emergency room visits to the Surveillance Program (for the purpose of tracking outbreaks like Ebola and COVID) and as Ron noted, the national boating injury definition theoretically should allow the real-time injury surveillance data pulls from each state to be more easily compared. The CDC now has a request process for such data pulls; if any state member is interested, Jonathan can connect them with the Center. Ron added that via the Safe States Alliance, he can provide contact information for members interested in being in touch with their state’s public health agency personnel for injury prevention.
- Brian Goodwin updated attendees on recent ABYC activities, especially Standards Week, which took place in January. He cited some standards currently up for review (A-33 Emergency Engine/Propulsion Cutoff and A-04 Fire Fighting Equipment); pointed to emerging topics and activities that arose during the week, including an autonomous vessel systems task force meeting, as well as work to identify gaps in the regulations and the standards as apply to electrification. He promoted a related, [upcoming, free webinar in the ABYC – USCG Risk Management Series, this one on “Staying Current with Electrification,” scheduled for May 3 \(2-4pm ET\)](#). In response to a question as to whether there is any work toward standardizing battery types and nomenclature given the implications for data collection in the future, Brian said that in terms of ratings systems, SAE is in the process of updating the standards they already use to rate gasoline propulsion engine so that way they will get a consistent rating across electric propulsion systems. In terms of battery technology, he is seeing a push toward lithium-ion phosphate technology, with several drop-in solutions, and will likely see it in a lot of applications in the smaller horsepower segment. Seth said those horsepower ratings will have implications for education and how those ratings relate to current statutory requirements.
- Pete Chisholm, chair of the NBSAC Boats & Associated Equipment (BAE) subcommittee, said the group has been having discussions in preparation for NBSAC’s May meeting, with a [focus on outdated regulations and gaps in same](#). Jeff Ludwig’s CG-BSX branch (Product Assurance) is looking at what they can do to address gaps and effect changes and updates to BAE-related regulations, many of which have been on the books unchanged since 1972. As an example, Pete noted that outboard powered boats with installed fuel systems have no federal requirements; there was an exception for outboard powered boats because most were inboard at that time.
- The final segment turned to a discussion around issues of member recruitment to the committee and included expressions of special appreciation to the newest committee members. While recruitment of volunteers is getting tougher, and there often is a learning curve – especially in ERAC where charges might not mesh seamlessly with a volunteer’s daily work – Seth stressed the value of gaining new perspectives. Deb said having charges that result in something tangible is also key because there is only so long that folks can grind through projects and not see results; she hopes that with the release of the CG-BSX policy letter and rollout, ERAC will attract interest and additional members to the fold.
- A round of thanks closed out the final minutes of the meeting, with well wishes to Seth in his new role at CG-BSX and to Tammy as she steps back into the role of ERAC chair. The meeting adjourned at 2:33p ET on a motion by Paul Littman, seconded by Pete Chisholm (and seconded x 2 by Jonathan Hsieh) 😊

## **CHARGE GROUPS (will be updated as needed)**

### **INVESTIGATION, REPORTING & ANALYSIS**

**ERAC-USCG IR&A 2023 cycle -Extension - Phase 1-Incident Reporting – No assigned team -- committee members will be called upon to participate in different aspects of the charge on an as-needed basis and as part of related charge work.**

**ERAC IR&A 2023-1 Best Practices Development (Incident Reporting) – Leads will be assigned to specific tasks identified during further discussions on CG-BSX Policy Letter rollout products:** Tammy Terry, Deb Green, Bryan Baronet, Jonathan Hsieh, Jeff Decker, Susan Weber (Joanna Andrade, lead on the Lighthouse, and Ron Sarver (NASBLA) will need to be informed and involved re placement/formatting on the website)

**ERAC IR&A 2023-2 Reporting System Redesign (Incident Reporting) – Charge team will monitor/participate in providing feedback to the revised CG-BAR form (from CG-BSX policy letter changes and pending Federal Register Notices for public comment on the data collection) and BARD-related modifications resulting from implementation of CG-BSX policy letter 23-01:-**Tammy Terry, Deb Green, Paul Littman, George Birdwell, Susan Weber, Jonathan Hsieh, Caroline Mantel, Pete Chisholm

**ERAC IR&A 2023-3 Human Factors: Refine Data Collection/Analysis:** Eric Lundin, Jonathan Hsieh, Jeff Decker, Pete Chisholm, Gene Molteni, Ted Sensenbrenner, Caroline Mantel, Karen Steely. Note: Joanna Andrade (CA) and Tammy Terry/Deb Green (OH) will be exploring potential for incorporating distraction coding on their respective states report forms.

### **KNOWLEDGE & CONTENT MANAGEMENT**

**ERAC K&CM 2023-1 Complete Lighthouse Reevaluation and Develop ERAC Product Placement/Marketing Plan --** Joanna Andrade (lead), Tammy Terry, Samm Teixeira, Jonathan Hsieh, Ron Sarver (NASBLA K&LM)

### **RBS STATISTICS & RESEARCH**

**ERAC S&R 2023-1 National Recreational Boating Safety Surveys (NRBSS)—2018 Follow-Up and Input to Upcoming Surveys:** Jonathan Hsieh and Tammy Terry (co-leads on specific aspects of charge), Joanna Andrade, Paul Littman

**ERAC S&R 2023-2 Investigate Factors Associated with Incidents During Pandemic Years –**Paul Littman (lead), Tammy Terry, Deb Green, George Birdwell, Eric Lundin, Jeff Decker, Jonathan Hsieh, Susan Weber, Gene Molteni, Ted Sensenbrenner, Karen Steely



Referenced on page 3 of meeting recap in discussions on Human Factors charge

Excerpt from [CONTRIBUTING FACTORS/CAUSES list](#)

Approved by NASBLA membership, Sept. 11, 2012; approved with recommended revisions, July 31, 2020, as part of the Recreational Boating Incident Reporting Policy Project work (**red indicates project-recommended updates from the 2012 version**)

## Proposed

**Improper Lookout/Inattention:** *The operator failed to perceive danger, resulting in the **incident**. This could have been with respect to failure(s) to perceive dangers outside or inside the vessel. May apply to violations of the requirement to maintain a proper lookout.* [Combines existing terms (“Improper Lookout” or “No proper watch” and “Operator Inattention”), creates new primary definition, and creates “distraction codes.”]

### Distraction codes for Improper Lookout/Inattention (**mandatory selection**)

- **Onboard lighting** – Glare from lighted the objects onboard the vessel, such as improperly shielded navigation lights, onboard electronics, and other similar devices. Specify.
- **Background lighting** – Lights on docks, shorelines, or other vessels. Specify.
- **Onboard electronics or equipment** – Using, attempting to use, viewing or operating onboard electronics or equipment, such as a navigation device, VHF radio, audio device, radar, autopilot, spotlight. Specify.
- **Wireless communication devices**—Using, attempting to use, viewing or operating mobile phones, tablets and other handheld devices. Specify.
- **Operator or occupant activity**—Activity such as sightseeing, moving objects, eating, drinking, smoking, interacting with passengers, fixated on other vessels or persons being towed, or otherwise distracted by other persons, **pets**, or objects in or outside the vessel. Specify.
- **Other distraction** – Details regarding the distraction are known, but none of the specified codes is applicable. Specify.
- **Unknown** – Insufficient facts to make any specific distraction determination.