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PROCEEDINGS

(9:00 a.m.)

CDR HILBERT: Good morning. I'm CDR Patrick Hilbert and I'm the division chief for the Hazardous Materials Standards Division ENG5 at Coast Guard Headquarters. I'm also the designated federal officer for the Chemical Transportation Advisory Committee.

Before we begin this morning, I'm going to turn it over to LT CDR Dixon, Sector Houston-Galveston for a safety briefing.

LT CDR DIXON: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to Sector.

Many of you have already heard my quick safety brief, but for those that were not here at the beginning of the week, once again I've just got to give a quick brief to go over the safety briefing that we normally have. I try to be a little funny with it, but we'll forego that and just go over the brief so you guys can get on your long day of training.

Right now there are no emergencies,
drills or exercises planned for today, so if you should hear and see any of the alarms go off, please treat them as actual events. Fortunately, we have many of our Coast Guard members stationed here in the building actually in presentations, so just follow them and they'll make sure that you're taken care.

In the event that we should have to evacuate the building, you have three primary exist. We have one right here that leads all the way straight downstairs to the outside, so you don't have to worry about being in the building at all. We also have these two wing exits, one of them you entered in, but there's also one on the back side over here. So please, don't everybody try to go into the same exit, you won't fit, we've done it, we've tried it, it doesn't work.

For bathrooms, bathrooms are straight down this hallway -- yes, I'm an aviator, I'm not a nautical, so I will be talking aviation style -- straight down this hallway, hit the
walls on my right-hand side, you'll have the
women's bathroom, left-hand side men's bathroom.

Also, just outside in the hallway
there's also another coffee mess, so you can have
your coffee mess right here but if you want the
flavored coffee or anything extra special,
there's a coffee mess in there that has the
specialty coffees brewing as well. All we ask is
for a small donation to help run it.

Any smokers, sorry, no federal laws
allow us to smoke in the federal building at all,
and made it as inconvenient as possible to allow
you to smoke on property. We do have a smoking
lamp all the way in the back corner near the
connex boxes. Don't worry, just look at all the
other blue suiters that are out there smoking.
And if you should have to come back in, we've
locked the doors down so you're going to have to
walk all the way back around to the front and
come into the front door, unless you're
piggybacking off of one our blue suiters that are
out there smoking. So word of advice, when
you're done, follow them in; otherwise, you have to walk around the building.

To talk about evacuating, if we have to evacuate for any reason, the muster point is going to be in the south parking lot -- yes, you all parked in the south parking lot, it's the only parking lot we have on property -- and along the fence line, please just go ahead and muster in one of the four groups. The rosters that you used to sign in and at the front desk will be used to make sure that you are good to go and accounted for.

If you do not sign out before going to lunch or anything like that, and I have an event that takes place, I will be looking for you -- not really. I'm the last guy out of the building and typically we don't let anybody stay in the building except for the two upstairs guys that are doing watches.

Aside from that, I think the risk assessment that was done for this event, obviously it is a training environment, we just
have low risk associated with this event,
however, as I mentioned before, we do have a lot
of wires and cables all over the floors and we
have these little pop-up trays for power and
network connectivity, they do like to stick up
and trip you. So be careful, we do have slip,
trip or fall hazards, especially in the hallway;
the nice shiny terrazzo flooring does get
slippery when it gets wet and it likes to hide in
that nice shine. So just be careful, be mindful
of where you're stepping.

Aside from that, unless you have any
questions, answers or comments, if you see
anything that needs improvement -- you saw I
changed a light bulb earlier in the projector --
anything else that we can do to make your visit
for training here at Sector, please don't
hesitate. Get with any of the blue suiters or
stop by my office, it's right here on the corner,
and let me know. This environment was actually
set up as a training environment for a maritime
town hall like training, so we're trying to give
back to the community and the industry partners that have brought us here.

So thank you, and good luck with your training.

CDR HILBERT: Thanks, Mr. Dixon.

Just a brief comment on CTAC history before we get going. For the record, CTAC was first established on May 4, 1949 through the Treasury Department. CTAC has since evolved and it's current chartered under the Department of Homeland Security. CTAC's charter was last renewed for two years, beginning on September 8, 2015, under the authority of Section 871 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Title 6, United States Code, Section 451.

This meeting was announced to the public in the Federal Register on Friday, January 13, 2017, under Docket Folder USCG2016-1073. There were no public comments submitted to the docket prior to today's meeting.

Now I'll just review today's agenda. Copies of today's agenda were handed out to you
all, and more are available in the back of the
room. Also, on the back of the agenda is a list
of common acronyms used during CTAC meetings.
Hopefully you'll find those helpful.

As stated in the Federal Register,
this meeting's agenda will consist of the
following: introductions and administrative
items, review of last meeting's minutes and
status of task items, Coast Guard leadership's
remarks, chairman's remarks, designated federal
officer's remarks.

The committee will review, discuss and
formulate recommendations on the following
subcommittee presentations and task statements:
Task Statement 1601, Hazardous Cargo
Transportation Security Subcommittee, called the
Security Subcommittee; Task Statement 13TAC03,
Safety standards for the design of vessels
carrying natural gas or using natural gas as
fuel, LNG Subcommittee. Then we're going to have
a public comment period.

Then the committee will review,
discuss and formulate any recommendations on the following subcommittee presentations and task statements: Task Statement 15TAC01, Marine vapor control systems certifying entities guidelines update, vapor control systems supplementary guidance for the implementation of the final rule, DCS Subcommittee. Then we'll have another public comment period.

Then we'll have the opportunity for the Coast Guard to make some presentations to the committee related to activities at the IMO, Mr. Pat Keffler is going to do that. Coast Guard rulemaking initiatives, I will provide a few comments on rulemaking germane to this committee, and then we'll also have Mr. Mike Brown who is here today from Coast Guard Headquarters, Office of Regulatory Affairs. And then Dr. Cyndi Znati has a quick update on the Chemical Data Guide, where that stands. Then we're also going to have a presentation on the lightning strike on methanol operation, and I believe James is going to give that.
And then almost to the end, we'll have some new business, any subcommittee recommendations, and then James will work out setting the next meeting date and location.

Just for everyone's awareness, Julie Blanchfield, LCDR Blanchfield is over there. She is doing a great job of trying to now use Homeport and putting information that's germane to this body and the various subcommittees on Homeport, so I encourage you to use that.

A couple of housekeeping items before we move forward. Please record your attendance. There is a sign-in sheet that should have your name on it that was circulated around the room here earlier this morning, so if you haven't seen that, when we're on a break, please make sure you sign it, that's important. And let's see, we were fortunate to have LT CDR Dixon come in and talk about some of the admin stuff as far as safety and the bathrooms and location of those, so I don't need to get into that. I already talked about the agenda.
As far as subcommittee final reports, there was some work completed yesterday by the VCS subcommittee. That was emailed out to CTAC members last night, and also was posted on the Homeport website for CTAC, so that's where that information is available.

Just for everyone's information, today we have Ms. Leslie Berridge, who is an electronic court reporter, she's keeping minutes for the permanent record. Official minutes will be prepared and will appear on CTAC's Homeport website within 90 days of this meeting. In order to be fully heard and understood each time you speak, please speak clearly and also identify yourself and the organization you're with before you begin your comments. This does, in fact, include CTAC members too. This is important, obviously, just for accurately capturing what's transpired here today, and James and I will be reminding you, if needed.

Again, we're trying to take good care of you, give you everything you need to do your
important work today. Please let me know or
James know if you need anything. I'd like to
thank our host, CPT Peter Martin, from Sector
Houston-Galveston, for allowing us to use this
wonderful facility today. We've had a great
first two days of the subcommittee meetings here,
and I can't say enough about the support of your
staff, sir, so we appreciate you opening up your
facility and accommodating CTAC.

Finally, I'd also like to recognize
Julie again. She's done a lot of the dirty work,
if you will, in preparing and getting us all here
today, so I feel she's done an exceptional job,
and I hope you all feel the same, as far as
keeping us informed and working also with the
Sector staff here to handle the logistics. So,
Julie, thank you on behalf of James and myself
for the work that you did.

Now we'll move on to introduction of
new members, and then we're also going to thank
some outgoing members. So we're going to call up
five individuals. I'd like to have Mr. Stephen
Boudreaux. Mr. James Prazak can come on up too because he's also getting -- well, you're not a new member but you're starting another term. Mr. Norman O'Shaughnessy, if you could come to the front of the room. Ms. Diane Keller-Cannon, CPT George Pontikos, and Mr. Morgan Johnson.

As per CTAC's charter and its membership balance plan, each of these members represents a viewpoint critical to the recommendations of this committee, and those are designated as follows: Mr. Morgan Johnson represents the viewpoint of the marine environmental protection community; CAPT Georg Pontikos, Ms. Diane Keller-Cannon, Mr. Normal O'Shaughnessy and Mr. James Prazak represent the viewpoint of marine handling or transportation of chemicals; Mr. Stephen Boudreaux and Delmas Jones -- Delmas, I forgot to call you up, my bad, come on up -- represent the viewpoint of chemical manufacturing.

Now we're going to go through and do the oath, so at this time I'll ask you all to
raise your right hand and repeat after me.

(Whereupon, the oath was administered.)

CDR HILBERT: Thank you all, and congratulations, and you may take your seats.

(Appplause.)

CDR HILBERT: WE do have some outgoing members that I'd like to recognize. On December 12, 2016, the then secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Jai Johnson, signed thank you letters for the following members: Mr. John Salvesen, Mr. Roger Restiano, Mr. Scott Brown, Mr. Paul Lambert, and Mr. Parmi Sandhu. We'd like to take a moment to thank these members for serving to the committee, and I'd like to invite James to make a few comments on the service of each of these gentlemen. We have three of those gentlemen here today.

Mr. Salvesen, Parmi and Mr. Lambert, if you'd all come forward, that would be great.

Come on up.

MR. PRAZAK: One of the traditions we
had some time back with CTAC was recognizing folks that have been here for a long time -- and try to get rid of them -- no, just kidding -- that have been here for a long time and done a lot of work with the committee, by giving them a token gift. Paul Book was with ACL and he was based up near Louisville, Kentucky, and Louisville has the Louisville Slugger, and so one of the deals that Paul started and we're now going to try to keep going with is a gift for these outgoing members.

Parmi has been on this committee for a long time, John has been on the committee for a long time, 20 years, and Paul.

MR. LAMBERT: Since 1970.

MR. PRAZAK: 1970. I'm old and I was four years old at that time.

Anyway, so these guys have done a heck of a lot of work on behalf of this industry, trying to make this industry better and everything else like that, so as a token gift, we got a bat for each of these gentlemen, and each
of these say: To the real big hitter -- this is Parmi Sandhu -- with our thanks, CTAC 2017. So with that, thank you very much.

(Pause for presentations and photos; applause.)

CDR HILBERT: The other thing I wanted to bring up, on an annual basis there are new membership opening opportunities. Our member terms are appointed for three years and they are staggered so that we do not have a large turnover in any given year. From the CTAC bylaws, CTAC members are able to serve up to two consecutive three-year terms on the committee. In 2017 we have ten members whose appointments are expiring; of those, seven are eligible for reappointment.

On Tuesday, February 14, 2017, we published a Federal Register notice announcing these membership vacancies and information on how and what is necessary to apply. A copy of that Federal Register notice is available for review in the back of the room. If you are interested, please consider volunteering to be a CTAC member.
All the items in the back are also available on that Homeport site that I mentioned earlier.

Before moving forward, a little more admin work to do. At our last meeting in September of 2016 in Washington, D.C., the 46 CFR 153 Subcommittee presented its final report and then became inactive. I'd like to take a minute to present a thank you letter to the committee and subcommittee from ADM Thomas for their hard work and outstanding output.

I'd like to have Mr. Jones come up.

"Dear Mr. Jones: My thanks to you as subcommittee chairman on the Chemical Transportation Advisory Committee, as well as to the CTAC members of this subcommittee for the high quality report delivered in response to Task Statement 13TAC01, Guidance on implementation and revisions MARPOL Annex II in the IBC Code 46 CFR 153. This report is exhaustive and delivered tables and documents are extremely thorough.

"The Coast Guard benefits from CTAC's unique ability to gather information from all
over the hazardous materials transportation
industry to best address the technical challenges
of ensuring safe, secure and environmentally
sound transportation of hazardous chemicals.

Recommendations in this CTAC report regarding
guidance and implementation of the revisions to
MARPOL Annex II in the IBC Code as it relates to
46 CFR 153 will be of great benefit to the Coast
Guard and the maritime industry.

"I congratulate the subcommittee's
participants on delivering this report. It shows
your expertise, diligence and attention to
detail. The Coast Guard truly values the efforts
and the results that CTAC provided and will
evaluate your recommendation and provide feedback
regarding implementation and future direction in
this area.

"Please accept my personal thanks and
convey my gratitude to the subcommittee for the
significant amount of time and effort devoted to
this report.

"Signed, Paul S. Thomas, Rear Admiral,
U.S. Coast Guard."

(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: And I'll add Delmas did a ton of work, if you ever saw his spreadsheets.

CDR HILBERT: Continuing on with the agenda, review of last meeting's minutes and status of task items.

Meeting minutes from our September 29, 2016 meeting were accepted on December 15 and published at that time on the CTAC's Homeport site. The committee members were provided copies of those minutes and reviewed them -- at least I hope they did -- prior to this meeting. A copy of those meeting minutes are also available at the back for the room and on the Homeport website, as I previously mentioned.

There were four task items ID'd in the meeting minutes and I will make comments regarding their status. The LNG task statement was revised and a new one signed by myself and Mr. Prazak. The task statement drafted regarding a potential new subcommittee to review the HAZSUB
twins rulemaking will be discussed later towards the end of the meeting.

With regards to poor bunker quality, the Coast Guard does not intend to seek input from CTAC at this time on that issue.

With regards to an outreach program, discussion between the chairman, the DFO, myself and the ADFOs continue on this topic.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, there will be a more detailed update on the bulk chemical data guide towards the end of this meeting from Dr. Znati, but at this time the Coast Guard is not seeking additional feedback on the guide from CTAC.

Now I'd like to introduce CAPT Peter Martin, Commander, Sector Houston-Galveston.

(Applause.)

CAPT MARTIN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to Sector Houston-Galveston. For the Texans in the room, I'd just like to say Howdy, pleased to see all y'all.

I'm CAPT Peter Martin, I'm the Sector
commander, and I'd just like to clear up a little confusion at the outset. Contrary to what CDR Dixon said, you're not here for training, you're here for work, and I thank you for that, and I'll explain momentarily why that's important.

Some of you are very familiar with the Coast Guard, in fact, some of you are retired Coast Guard officers. Some of you are very familiar with Houston and Galveston Bay, but some of you are not, so if you'll just indulge me for a moment, I'll just explain very briefly kind of what we do here at Sector Houston-Galveston before I get into the substance of my comments.

So who am I? I wear a number of different hats. I am the search and rescue mission coordinator for this area. Essentially, we have a command center here that coordinates federal search and rescue. If we have a rescue scenario, someone is in distress, we coordinate with everyone in the area to provide assistance as quickly as possible to prevent loss of life.
most sophisticated maritime search planning
software here where we try and figure out where
the distress victims are after an elapsed period
of time following distress.

I'm also the federal maritime security
coordinator. I chair the Area Maritime Security
Committee. The Coast Guard, we pass judgment on
facility security plans, we work very closely
with facility security officers and other state,
local, federal partners to ensure security of
this region, to protect our waterfront facilities
and our waterways.

I'm also the federal on-scene
coordinator, responsible for pollution response.
Probably many of you know that the Coast Guard
is the equivalent the EPA in the coastal zone.
We're responsible for investigating pollution
incidents, we deploy people to the scene, secure
the source, identify who's responsible and
require them to clean up the pollution to
mitigate environmental degradation.

I'm also the officer in charge of
marine inspection. My staff routinely inspects U.S. flagged vessels on behalf of the United States Flag State Administration to ensure that they're properly constructed, they're manned appropriately and equipped with the required safety and firefighting equipment and things of that nature. We also provide similar services to foreign vessels calling on our port to protect the mariners, protect their ship's cargoes, but also to protect our nationally critical waterways here in Houston.

Finally, I'm the captain of the port, responsible for waterway safety and security, responsible for the safety and security of waterfront facilities. I can control vessel movement, suspend cargo operations at waterfront facilities, things of that nature, to protect the waterways, protect our economically critical waterfront facilities.

So that's a little bit about what I do.

This is my area of responsibility.
I'm responsible for Coast Guard operations through an expansive area extending from 60 miles east of Lake Charles, Louisiana to the eastern bank of the Colorado River, the Texas-Oklahoma border out to the seaward extent of the U.S. exclusive economic zone.

Just a little bit about the tools I have to do the job. I've got three marine safety units, one in Lake Charles, Louisiana, one in Port Arthur, Texas and one in Texas City, and they help me fulfill those responsibilities as captain of the port, federal on-scene coordinator and federal maritime security coordinator. I've also got four response boat stations here in Freeport, Texas, Galveston, up in Houston, Sabine and Lake Charles. I've also got four armed patrol boats and a number of other resources.

Here in Galveston we have a big logistics facility. We've got an aids to navigation team and two inland construction tenders, tremendously important to commerce here in this area. They set and maintain the buoys,
the channel markers and range markers that are
critical for safe navigation, and I'll speak a
little bit more about why that's so important
here.

A couple of other units, we've got an
air station here. They don't belong to me but
I'm their primary customer. They have three
helicopters there for search and rescue, homeland
security and marine environmental response.

So that's a little bit about what we
have here in Houston.

A little bit about what we do on a
daily basis. On any given day it averages three
lives saved or assisted. We distinguish between
lives saved and assisted. Lives saved means
someone is in distress and if we don't get
someone there quickly to assist them, life is
going to be lost. Lives assisted are a little
bit less than that, somebody needs assistance,
they're not in immediate distress, we need to get
help to them, if we don't get help to them, that
situation could deteriorate and result in loss of
life.

Twenty vessel inspections, as I mentioned, to ensure the safety of mariners, their vessels, cargoes. Thirty-five aids to navigation discrepancies. As I mentioned, we maintain the integrity of the aids to navigation system. We're constantly having aids to navigation knocked down in this area, run down by ships and barges, so we're constantly replacing buoys and channel markers to maintain the integrity of that system.

A lot of traffic through this area. On any given day we probably have upwards of 500 tug and barge movements, as well as 86 deep draft vessel arrivals. Inspect four waterfront facilities for safety, security and compliance with environmental protection regulations.

We do a number of security boardings, sometimes offshore if we have vessels that we think may harbor a threat to the homeland. You may or may not know about this, but foreign vessels calling on our port are required to
provide us 96 hours notice of arrival, and when
that happens, we work with Customs and Border
Protection to vet the ships, their crews, their
voyage history to ensure the legitimacy of their
voyage. And any time we have increased concern
about the legitimacy of a vessel or its voyage
history, we'll hold them offshore and we'll do an
armed security boarding just to assure ourselves
of the legitimacy of their voyage and kind of
deter any potential threats to the homeland.

Marine casualty investigations, on any
given day we have three of those open. We
investigate marine casualties to identify causal
factors and thereby preclude recurrence, and I'll
talk a little bit more about why that's important
here in Houston.

We issue mariner credentials, licenses
for commercial mariners. We undertake suspension
and revocation proceedings on licenses when
mariner competence, medical fitness or negligence
is in question.

We also respond to pollution
incidents, as I mentioned.

A little bit about priorities. So as I mentioned, I'm the Sector commander. More importantly to you, however, I'm the captain of the port, and thus, the lead federal regulator for maritime safety, security and environmental protection. So while contemplating the thoughts I'd impress upon this morning, it occurred that we're united by a common interest, and that's the profitability of your individual organizations and the prosperity of the surrounding region. Both depend on the safe, secure and efficient operation of the ports in my area of responsibility.

The work of the Chemical Transportation Advisory Committee is tremendously important. You know this, of course, otherwise, you wouldn't be here, but nonetheless, I'll share with you why I think it's important.

Quite simply, when crafting regulatory requirements and national policy, we feds don't always get it right, and that should surprise no
one. Our regulatory initiatives and policy statements are typically driven by a compelling public interest, but as with nearly all government requirements, there are often unintended consequences, despite the best of intentions. And while we may be experts in waterway safety and waterway security, we're not necessarily subject matter experts in the chemical industry and it's difficult to craft a national standard that applies perfectly everywhere and at all times. So your counsel on important questions and issues before this committee helps us make better, more informed decisions, and thereby protect the public interest in a manner that's least burdensome to the industry while also mitigating the risk of unintended consequences.

So since receiving orders to command Sector Houston-Galveston, I've given a lot of thought to my duties and responsibilities, and I'm of the view that my overarching responsibility is to facilitate commerce in a
manner that's compatible with public safety, national security and environmental stewardship. And what I mean by this is that I recognize the importance of the chemical industry and the maritime community to our collective prosperity.

In 2015, for example, the three ports of Galveston Bay trans-shipped approximately 294 million short tons of cargo, and this exceeded any other port in the country, and you can see the statistics up here. You know, Houston, when combined with Texas City and Galveston, were above South Louisiana and really dwarfed New York City as the next closest competitor. The Port of Houston alone produces $630 billion in economic impact annually that accounts for 16 percent of the GDP in the State of Texas, and some 2.7 million jobs, and while most of us don't realize it, the chemical industry produces countless products on which the quality of life depends. You keep people employed and you help keep recession at bay. Your contribution to the national well-being and national security is not
lost on me.

This contribution to our national well-being must, however, be reconciled with public safety, national security and environmental stewardship. These are strong, valid and competing interests, to be sure, and they must remain in balance. This is achieved through your commitment of time, experience, expertise and practical solutions. This balance is tremendously important here in Galveston Bay because there's an abundance of hazardous cargoes moving through the local waterways on a regular and routine basis. Many of these chemicals have great potential to compromise public safety if released into the surrounding communities or handled inappropriately.

This point was illustrated clearly in March of 2015 when the Motor Vessels Carla Maersk and Conti Peridot collided in the Upper Houston Ship Channel in the vicinity of Morgan's Point. A large cargo of MTBE was compromised, and due to the nature of that incident and the sensitivity
of the cargo, salvage operations were complex and
time-consuming. The Houston Ship Channel was
consequently closed for four days at an estimated
cost of $7 billion. All waterfront facilities
above Morgan's Point, production, import-export
facilities were adversely affected by the closure
of the waterway.

With respect to national security, it
doesn't seem to me that the world is becoming a
safer place. Quite the contrary. The United
States seems to have an abundance of adversaries
throughout the world who would welcome our
downfall and who would readily shed our blood.
Concurrently, we seem to have a growing
population of just plain crazy people residing
among us. Unsurprisingly, the chemical industry
represents potentially inviting targets for those
intent on death and destruction, while the
maritime domain offers an avenue through which to
strike and inflict grave consequences on our
nation and its citizens.

We live in a free, democratic and open
society, and we assume great risk for that freedom that we enjoy, yet we also seem to demand assurances as to our security at the same time.
And one lesson that history continues to impress is that it's exceedingly difficult to defend against someone who is willing to give their life for their cause. Make no mistake, maritime security remains a vital national concern and threats to our homeland and its citizens are unlikely to dissipate any time soon.

Environmental stewardship, well, that's a gift that we'll bequeath to our children, our grandchildren and future generations, or it's a gift that we'll withhold. I'm particularly mindful of this of late in light of renewed emphasis on deregulation, and I think EPA is squarely in the crosshairs of that debate, and while I have no wish to impede commerce and I have no wish to render U.S. businesses uncompetitive in the international arena, I also have no wish to return to the days of Love Canal and Exxon Valdez.
So these are valid and competing interests, and with your carefully crafted recommendations, I think we can achieve and maintain a reasonable balance among them. It's important because when this balance is upset, my discretion as captain of the port dissipates and adverse consequences follow.

Consider the following example. March 2014, we had a collision between the Motor Vessel Summer Wind and the Tug Miss Susan in the Texas City Y. The Tug Miss Susan was pushing a barge that was loaded with heavy fuel oil, 4,000 barrels of heavy fuel oil was spilled into Galveston Bay as a result, and the waterway was closed for five days at an estimated cost of $8.5 billion. All waterfront facilities north of the Galveston Bay entrance channel were adversely affected by this incident.

More recently, Motor Vessel Aframax River suffered a mechanical casualty in September of last year, backed into a mooring dolphin while putting to sea. The collision punctured a fuel
tank and spilled some 87,000 gallons of low sulphur diesel into the waterway in the Upper Houston Ship Channel. The fuel promptly ignited and a raging fire that threatened not only the vessel but assisting tugs and adjacent tankers that were actively engaged in operations, as well as petrochemical facilities that populate the waterfront in the Upper Houston Ship Channel.

So I call this to your attention merely to illustrate the persistent need to actively manage the transportation of hazardous chemicals. Failure to do so invites scrutiny from influential bodies such as the National Transportation Safety Board and risks federal intervention with associated risks of unintended consequences.

So the work of this committee is, therefore, tremendously important when ensuring that we do indeed actively manage the marine transport of chemicals in a safe, secure and practical manner, a manner which facilitates commerce while balancing the valid and competing
interests in public safety, national security and environmental stewardship.

And with that, I'll briefly describe some of the efforts the Coast Guard has taken locally here with our port partners in the Lone Star Harbor Safety Committee, the Area Maritime Security Committee, and the Central Texas Coastal Area Committee.

So the Houston-Galveston Area Maritime Security Committee is a mature committee, comprised of some 300 port stakeholders who are directly involved with or impacted by local maritime industry. Their work, collaboratively with the Coast Guard, enhances port security, helps prepare for and respond to transportation security incidents, and recover quickly from security incidents to minimize the disruption of commerce through our economically critical port facilities.

We also benefit from what in my experience is a rather unique arrangement embodied in the Houston Ship Channel Security
The industry-sponsored Houston Ship Channel Security District funds compelling security needs that can't be met by federal, state or local authorities. The Houston Ship Channel, for example, is arrayed with closed circuit television security cameras, but the Coast Guard lacks the staffing to monitor those cameras. The Houston Ship Channel Security District consequently funds several Harris County Sheriff's deputies that sit in my command center and alert my watch to any anomalies in waterway safety and security.

The Houston Ship Channel Security District also contributes matching funds required to make port security grant fund proposals filed. In 2016, the Area Maritime Security Committee, with the help of the Houston Ship Channel Security District, secured $7 million in grant funding here for the Houston area. That's second only to New York City.

The Central Texas Coastal Area Committee is similarly a mature committee, that
is meeting today, in fact, and I sent my deputy
down there to represent me so that I could join
you this morning. The area committee is
persistently engaged in planning for quick,
efficient and effective pollution response to
minimize environmental degradation while also
minimizing the impact of pollution incidents on
commerce in Galveston Bay. The area committee
planning has facilitated expeditious cleanup of
the incidents resulting from the marine
casualties I previously mentioned, and were
instrumental in reopening the waterways and
resuming commerce.

The Lone Star Harbor Safety Committee
similarly brings a wide range of port
stakeholders together to focus on waterway safety
and related issues, and it's been particularly
active. The committee is working hard to devise
ways to improve waterways efficiency and thereby
reduce the risk of a marine casualty that would
induce a waterway closure.

So this is some statistics on 2016 for
marine casualties: 171 vessel casualties, 21
groundings, collisions, elisions and 89 other
incidents that potentially threaten the waterway
and threaten to dissipate my discretion and force
me to close the waterway with tremendous economic
impact.

This illustrates some of the volume of
traffic that we're dealing with here in Houston.
Tanker transit, on an average date 39, as many as
56 tanker transits. We've got freighters, cruise
ships, upwards of 400 tug and barge movements,
just a tremendous amount of traffic. Add to that
ferry transits and anywhere between 80 and 110
ships in port, anywhere between 40 and 60 ships
anchored offshore, just a tremendously busy
place. Huge volume of traffic, a lot of
potential for marine casualty, a lot of incentive
to find ways to be more efficient in the movement
of traffic and reduce the risk of marine
casualty.

These are the annual statistics for
our vessel traffic service area. You can see
nearly 140,000 movements of tugs and barges
throughout Galveston Bay, movement of ships over
22,000, a variety of other commercial vessels,
and then add ferries to that, we're looking at
close to 280,000 transits per year of all sorts
of commercial vessels in this waterway, just
hugely congested waterway.

So earlier this month, the Lone Star
Harbor Safety Committee convened a terminal and
refinery managers symposium to impress upon that
audience a couple of things. First, the volume
of traffic in Galveston Bay and the inefficiency
of current port practices, and our collective
interest in mitigating the risk of a marine
casualty that would close the waterway with
resultant economic impacts.

The Lone Star Harbor Safety Committee
also staffs a port coordination team that works
collaboratively to organize and prioritize the
safe flow of commerce following an extended
waterway closure. This occurs most frequently
when we have fog, that's a persistent problem
here in the wintertime in Houston-Galveston, and it becomes unsafe to move vessels in Galveston Bay.

But the port coordination team also convenes following a major hurricane or any other prolonged waterway closure, including an increase in maritime security condition or a national terrorist incident, and they convene to help organize and prioritize and expedite the marine transportation.

The Lone Star Harbor Safety Committee is also exploring how to facilitate the legally required COC exams more efficiently. So there's lots of enthusiasm to do certificate of compliance exams offshore, but I simply don't have the resources to do that, and some facilities here in Houston-Galveston area have declined to permit the COC exams due to unfounded fear that ships will be contained at their facility, and we'll speak more about that here in a moment.

One of the points that I pressed
during the terminal and refinery managers
symposium was the need for terminal and refinery
managers to accommodate COC exams at their
facilities and thereby alleviate the inefficient
and unnecessary movements that are undertaken
merely to comply with COC requirements.

The committee also forwarded a
proposal for a new anchorage in the vicinity of
Bolivar that would help us do COC exams there in
a more efficient manner.

And in conclusion, I appreciate your
work and I hope I've succeeded in impressing upon
you why I think your work is important. As I
mentioned, I'm the lead federal regulator for
maritime safety, security and environmental
stewardship, and I can't facilitate commerce and
balance these strong and competing interests
without your help. So thank you for your
commitment to this process and the investment of
your time, talent, experience and expertise.

Thanks in particular to James Prazak
and others of the committee, George Pontikos, and
several others, who are not only involved in this committee but they're active in the Lone Star Harbor Safety Committee, as well as the Area Maritime Security Committee and the Central Texas Coastal Area Committee.

And with that, I'd like to invite my prevention chief, Eric Carrero, to come up to the podium. He's going to talk to you a little bit about the certificate of compliance exam and that process and where that's going.

So thank you folks.

(Applause.)

CDR CARRERO: Good morning, everybody. I'm Eric Carrero, the chief of the prevention department here at Sector Houston-Galveston, so under my umbrella I have inspections, investigations, and the waterways. If there's anything that I can do for any of you, I'm just a phone call away.

I just want to talk real quick, like the Captain mentioned, in 2016 we had over 9,000 vessel arrivals, actually 9,154 arrivals. That's
1 like the most for any coastal sector out there.
2 Out of the 9,000 arrivals, we completed over 700
3 COC exams. We do 56 percent of the nation's COC
4 exams, just one unit, 56 percent of the nation's
5 COC. That means we're very busy. It seems like
6 I have a big group to help me. Actually, when I
7 do domestics, foreign state control, mooring
8 casualty investigation, waterways, I only have a
9 bullpen of about 15 COC inspectors available for
10 this.

11 Something I want to mention is when we
12 do inspections here, over 700 COCs, we only
13 detained twelve vessels last year. When we
14 detain a vessel, I'm old school, we try to work
15 with the industry, we try to work with mariners
16 to figure out what went wrong with that vessel.
17 Minor things that we can fix on the spot, we'll
18 fix it, we'll allow the vessel to continue cargo
19 operations. Sometimes we find safety and
20 security issues that we need to detain the
21 vessel. Out of those twelve detentions, none of
22 them were appealed because we have excellent
ground for detention. Most of them, as you can see, we're talking about firefighting, we're talking about lifesaving, sometimes the deck was not working, that's a big item when you're doing cargo operations of a chemical that is highly flammable and now you have not capabilities for firefighting. So just keep in mind that number, twelve detentions.

When we detain a vessel here, that doesn't mean that the vessel is going to be attached to the pier. That means that we're going to detain the vessel, we're going to work with the vessel, sometimes we're going to allow the vessel to move to a lay-by berth maybe offshore, so the facilities in this area, they're afraid that when the Coast Guard is doing a COC exam, if there's a detention, the vessel is going to be tied to the pier and they cannot conduct any type of operations. Once again, our job here is to facilitate commerce, we're not going to do that, we're going to allow the vessel to move, depending on the safety and security issues, to a
lay-by berth or like an inshore anchorage.

    CAPT MARTIN: And Eric, twelve
detentions out of how many exams?

    CDR CARRERO: Out of 700 exams just
for COCs.

    So when you look at this, the problem
in Houston is some of the facilities, they don't
want to do the COC exams at their facilities
because they're looking at the detention. When
we look at the ration, 700 inspections, twelve
detentions, and like I mentioned, we're not going
to tie the vessel to the pier, there's nothing to
be worried about.

    Like the Captain mentioned, we had a
COC workgroup. We're trying to figure out how
can we better manage our workload here in
Houston. Right? So we're trying to doing pier
COC exams because right now if I sent a team
offshore to do a COC exam, it's just one team for
the day. They need to drive to Galveston, they
need to go to a small vessel to go to the
anchorage, do the COC exam, back to the pier,
back to the unit. That's a full day for just one
team, one COC exam. When I do it at the pier, I
can send a team of two or three to different
vessels to do the mission. So it's cost-
effective, it's a better management for me to do
the exams at the pier.

So we're working very close with the
facilities. I personally go to the facilities
and I try to explain to them, hey, please allow
the COC exam, we're not going to detain a vessel,
we're not going to take a long time to conduct a
COC, we're not going to stop any cargo
operations. When we do the COC exam, yes,
there's going to be a cargo shutdown, but once
we're done with that, the vessel is going to
continue with the cargo operations. So that's
part of the committee we have here, that's part
of the subcommittee. We try to go out, talk to
the facilities, let them know, hey, we're not
going to detain any vessel, you can continue to
do cargo operations.

As far as the COC workgroup that many
of you are part of, we have the cargo waiver process. The cargo waiver process means that the if the COC is expired but we have a window of 90 days, I can issue a COC cargo waiver that allows the vessel to proceed to the facility and commence cargo operations before the Coast Guard gets onboard and completes the COC exam. One of the recommendations of the workgroup is to allow that cargo waiver to be 180 days. Well, here in Sector Houston-Galveston, I cannot change that but I can support it with asking the committee to provide a white paper through the Sector commander to District 8 and send that to Coast Guard Headquarters to make a change to this actual regulation. I think it's well done, we've been working very close with industry here, and it's working great.

This is something that we send to the master. The master will attest to the safety and security of the vessel and we'll go down the checklist and will sign, telling me, hey, Coast Guard, I need a check on my vessel, everything is
working properly. So we take that in consideration, we grant the cargo waiver, and the vessel is allowed to continue to the facility.

I must say before I was issuing maybe two cargo waivers a week, now we issue between two to three a day. And that's part of the workgroup process, that we take this inconsideration, and I pretty much approve 90 percent of them. If there's no safety issues or security issues with the vessel, I'll approve it, the vessel will go to the facility.

Last year we had two cases where we issued a cargo waiver and the master they forget that we're going to go onboard. When we issue the cargo waiver, that means you can proceed to the facility but you cannot leave my AOR. We need to conduct a COC before you depart this area. So sometimes in two occasions the master signed the cargo waiver, everything was great, we went onboard and that was not the case. Two cases that we detained the vessel, we moved the vessel to the lay-by berth, but now I have a
signature from the master telling me that the vessel was in good shape. We're talking about civil penalties.

In one case I was working with the Coast Guard Investigative Services because this can be an environmental crime, so civil penalties, criminal case, it's going to cost the vessel. So we try to work with the manager. When we receive things like this, we need to make sure that everybody in the industry understands the consequences. If we want to move from 90 days to 180 days, I cannot see more of this coming my way where the captain says everything is good, we go onboard, it's a different story.

And this is pretty much just in a nutshell. We try to work with industry for COCs. Chemical vessels here is huge. We train only Sector Houston-Galveston, but my department, I call it Training Sector Houston because I receive a lot of TDY here. Every week I get between two to three coasties from different units here in Sector Houston-Galveston to get chemical tanker
qualification. We do a lot, we train our people but we work with industry. Most of the things during the year or most of my accomplishments are because of a great relationship with industry.

I want to thank some of you in the audience because they're part of the workgroups that we have, the subcommittees, the committee, and I thank you guys for being here because we cannot do it by ourselves. We need your expertise, we need your experience to help us carry out our mission. So thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CAPT MARTIN: Questions?

MR. FORAN: I've got one.

CDR HILBERT: State name and company.

MR. FORAN: Paul Foran with CMR.

Back to the COC inspections, since I do the siren inspections, this is of very great interest to me and my company, were you saying there's a possibility that will be extended up to 180 days now?

CDR CARRERO: That was part of the
subcommittee that we have working on the COC, the
COC workgroup, that was part of the
recommendations. We talked about this a couple
of weeks ago, I briefed my captain about the
recommendation. Right now what I asked of the
committee is to provide a paper, provide that
recommendation from 90 to 180 days. I talked to
my captain, we'll support that, it will go to
Coastal District. CAPT Martin is talking to ADM
Callahan a lot about this issue. ADM Callahan,
the district commander, is fully aware that
Sector Houston-Galveston is very busy with the
COCs, we need to allow this. The blessing from
Sector Houston-Galveston is there, D-8 is going
to support this as well, and then it's going to
go to Coast Guard Headquarters for them to make a
determination. So yes, it's a work in progress,
sir.

MR. FORAN: Thank you.

CDR CARRERO: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CDR CARRERO: Thank you.
(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: Before I sit down, I'll add a couple of things to the conversation, and we really appreciate the captain and the commander coming in here to talk to us today.

Houston is a major hub of the industry, and I was counting ten of the folks sitting around the membership table are Houston based out of about 23 of us, so not quite half. So it's an important part of the industry and the industry here works very, very closely with the Coast Guard, and the Coast Guard works very, very closely with the industry, and it's that relationship that helps a lot get done.

He showed the pictures of the Aframax River. One of the really cool things about that -- not about the incident itself --

CDR CARRERO: No, that wasn't cool at all.

MR. PRAZAK: -- but at the last Lone Star meeting we had on February 10, ADM Callahan was here and CAPT Martin both presented awards to
the Houston pilots, the Port of Houston firefighters and the tugboat guys from the assist tugs for the ship that were involved in protecting that ship. They slept with the ship. You had two pilots onboard who were one on either side of the bridge wings who actually suffered some burns and some things trying to hold that ship to be able to see where it was at in the middle of that fire.

You had the tugboats that stayed alongside with the ropes attached pulling that ship, trying to hold it in closer -- because I think that there was a ship passing at the time as well -- trying to hold her where she was so she didn't collide again or get out in the channel where she had a bigger problem, until their lines got discarded because they burned in half.

And then you had the Port of Houston firefighters that came in with fireboats to actually start putting that fire out.

So it was very, very good and it was
great to do it in front of the Harbor Safety Committee to recognize those guys with a really, really good award and recognition for what they had done.

The COCs is a huge deal. Because of what some of these terminals are doing, it's forcing ships to go to lay-bay berths which is an extra voyage in and an extra voyage out. That's adding to our congestion, and if we have an incident just because a ship was making a run up to go for an inspection to a lay-by berth, why, when it's not necessary. It should have been able to come straight into the berth it needed to load at under the waiver, get its inspection done, and hopefully be doing cargo even before then. So we're trying to change that attitude and that's why that symposium was such a big deal for us.

And I really appreciate, Captain, one, for the facilities, again, this is a great place for us to have meetings, but the work they do with the industry is amazing. Thank you.
(Applause.)

CDR HILBERT: Good morning, everyone, again. CDR Patrick Hilbert, and just a few comments from me before I turn it over to James and we get into the meat of our work here today. I just wanted to thank CAPT Martin again for hosting CTAC. We collectively appreciate you, sir, opening up your facility and the support of your staff's time and all of our requests leading up to the last three days here at Sector Houston.

Oddly enough, this is my first CTAC meeting as the DFO since arriving to take over the Hazardous Materials Division last summer, and it also happens to by last opportunity to serve as the DFO for CTAC because I'm going to be moving back to Juneau, Alaska this summer to take over the chief of prevention for Coast Guard 17th District. I've had only a brief time to re-familiarize myself with the substantive issues on CTAC's plate and to get to know members of the committee.

I want to thank James for his
leadership to the committee, and most of all, thank him for his time. For those of you who know James well, I think you'll all certainly agree that he has a battery that seemingly never runs down. I'm not sure when he sleeps, if at all, but I'm sure he squeezes in a few hours a week. But I really appreciate his time working with me and helping my transition into this role and being patient with the Coast Guard as the blue suiters move around and help with the management and oversight of this committee. So thank you, James.

We're all very fortunate to have James sitting in the chairman's seat. Having spoken to James, he views his membership on CTAC and his role as chairman as an opportunity to give back to the American people, and I feel he's truly succeeded in this regard.

And thank you to all the committee members for being here this week, supporting the task statements laid out before you at previous committee meetings. The recommendations CTAC
provides are invaluable in supporting Coast
Guard's role in overseeing security, safety and
environmental stewardship of our nation's complex
maritime transportation system.

I'll keep my additional comments
brief. I thought I could just touch on a few of
the changes that are going to occur at Coast
Guard Headquarters this summer that might impact
some of the people in this room. Since many of
you are aware that RADM Paul Thomas is
transitioning from the assistant commandant for
Prevention Policy this summer to assume command
of Coast Guard 8th District and take over for
RADM Callahan. Taking ADM Thomas's place at
Coast Guard Headquarters will be RADM Peter
Gautier, who happens to be a chemical engineer
like myself, and Pat Keffler and Dr. Znati and
Julie Blanch field, and he'll be taking over that
role as the assistant commandant for Prevention
at Coast Guard Headquarters.

A few just changes internal to ADM
Thomas's staff at Coast Guard Headquarters.
Since last summer, there's a new office that's been created, it's the Office of Merchant Mariner Credentialing, it's call MMC, it's under the leadership of Ms. Mayte Medina. Ms. Mayte Medina for Mr. Lantz, Jeffrey Lantz, I think many of you know him. And we're fortunate to have now all those merchant mariner credentialing policy issues under one office. If you remember, for those of you who were here in fall of 2016, Mr. Lantz addressed the group on some comments at that time at Coast Guard Headquarters.

Also, another actual headquarters unit, but many of you know now Captain Select Jason Smith, who leads the Liquified Gas Carrier National Center of Expertise. He's going to be moving on this summer, he's going to be moving down to the deputy at Corpus Christi, so staying in D-8, staying in Texas. His new detachment chief, I think we're fortunate to have LCDR Dallas Smith, who is currently at the NCOE and very well versed on LNG issues, he's going to be taking over leadership there.
As far as other office chiefs at Coast Guard Headquarters, my boss, CAPT Hawkins, who is the head of CG-ENG is staying put for at least another year, and then CG-OES is not changing, Marine Safety Center, CAPT John Mauger is staying, at least for another year in command of the MSC.

On the compliance front, some of you deal with Commercial Vessel Compliance Office, CAPT Jennifer Williams is moving on, and CAPT Matt Edwards, who is currently the XO at the Marine Safety Center, is going to be transitioning over to take control of that office.

As far as my replacement as the division chief for Hazardous Materials, CDR Marc Montemerlo, who is currently the CID down in Sector Jacksonville, is going to be coming to take over that division and also be filling this role as DFO for CTAC starting fall of 2017.

Of course, there are many other moving parts during the annual summer blue suit shuffle,
but I hope that's just a quick overview that
might help you, and please feel free on a break
or post the conclusion of this meeting to ask me
any questions about that.

Later in the meeting, I mentioned
we'll have some briefs from coasties on IMO, the
Chemical Data Guide, and some regulatory
projects.

At this time, thank you again to all
the volunteers of the committee, and I'll turn it
over to James. Thank you.

MR. PRAZAK: Good morning. So we'll
crank up here.

A couple of formalities that I'd like
to go through real quick. As far as the agenda,
we're going to play things a little bit loose as
far as exactly when we break. If people start
going toward the break and half the room
leaves, I may go ahead and call a break if I have
to. Okay?

Based on looking at the agenda, I
think we're going to blow through the agenda
pretty quickly. We'll kind of play it by ear as we get closer to lunchtime, but tentatively, is everybody okay if we go ahead and blow through, if it looks like we're going to finish pretty quickly around 1:00-ish or so, 1:30, are you okay if we just keep going? Okay. So we'll play it by ear but we may just blow through lunchtime to press on and that way people can get back to their flights and things on time.

Special request, I believe it's over there where CDR Blanchfield is. A lot of you committee members and even some of the folks who are not, know Larry Russell from NFPA. Larry was recently diagnosed with esophageal cancer.

Anyway, fortunately, he sent us a note a few weeks ago and he had surgery and it came out very, very well, it hadn't spread from what they can tell. He is not going to have to have chemotherapy, he will have to have some radiation only on one side, but overall it's looking very, very good for him and he's in good spirits but they think they've caught it.
So we have a card right there with markers and everything, asking everyone to go sign the card and put a note in there if you'd like to. It's a huge card so it can handle a lot of signatures and notes. What I'll do is after the meeting and I get back to the office next week, I'll send the card to a florist up there and then have them take the card and some flowers to him on behalf of CTAC to kind of wish him well and lift his spirits and everything. So if you get a chance, please take sometime during the breaks to sign off on the card or before the meeting ends and wish him some good wishes.

We are going to have some votes for some subcommittee final reports, and then we also have the Coast Guard presented us with a new proposed tasking that we would like to discuss, so anyway, that will come up later in the meeting as well so be prepared for that as it comes through.

Besides that, I don't have a whole lot of special comments to make other than thanks to
the Coast Guard here in Houston for hosting us
this week, as always. Again, the facilities are
amazing and awesome and they take great care of
us, to be honest, and so we really, really
appreciate all the local folks who help make this
happen. Again, thanks to the Commander and LCDR
Blanchfield and Pat and Cyndi and everybody else,
Bob Ryan from the security side, from
headquarters to help us with our meeting and our
subcommittee meetings and everything we do as
well. All of that is key to how we get our work
done.

For the visitors who have not been
here before, which is probably not very many of
you, this is the formal meeting, this is the
meeting where we essentially get an update on
where we're at and look at what we're going to do
in the future. We are going to have public
comment periods and after presentations the
public is more than invited to ask questions.
Okay? It's not just us up here, we need your
input. That's how we get things done and are
The real work happens in the subcommittees which was the last two days of work. That's where we have a lot more interaction and discussion and debate and arguments and everything else, but that's where the work happens. So if you really want to give some input and be involved, start with the subcommittees. That's where you're going to be active and have a whole lot of stuff to add. We need your expertise, we need your knowledge, we need your point of view to be successful.

Other than that, remember that we do have the court reporter here, and what I'd like to do before we go any further is I want to run around and do introductions real fast and let everybody introduce themselves.

So before I do that, I guess I should point out that there's a new gentleman sitting up here at the table. Parmi's term expired and so that slot opened up for the vice chair, and so the decision was made through the Coast Guard for
Soren Ibsen to take over as the vice chair of
CTAC. So I'd like to welcome Soren into the
position and congratulate him on the new role.

(Applause.)

CDR HILBERT: With that, Captain, do
you want to start just real quick? I know we
know who you are, but do you want to do it one
more time?

CAPT MARTIN: Good morning again.

Peter Martin, Sector Commander, Sector Houston-
Galveston.

CDR HILBERT: Good morning. CDR
Patrick Hilbert, chief of the Hazardous Materials
Division and CTAC designated federal officer.

MR. PRAZAK: James Prazak with Tricon
Energy.

CAPT IBSEN: Soren Ibsen with Q88 and
Milbros.

MR. PONTIKOS: George Pontikos with
Odfjell USA.

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: Konstantin
Dimitropoulos, Driftwood LNG.
MR. JONES: Delmas Jones, Ineos.

MR. TEMPERILLI: John Temperilli,
Center for Toxicology and Environmental Health.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: Ashley Castle-
Carpenter, Aura Engineering.

MR. YOUNG: Jon Young, Warner
Nicholson Engineering.

MR. HAYDEN: Bill Hayden, Waller
Marine here in Houston.

MR. UNGER: Pat Unger, Seabulk
Tankers.

MR. CORIGLIANO: Ron Corigliano,
Campbell Transportation Company.

MR. BOUDREAU: Stephen Boudreaux,
Shell.

MR. MONIGAN: Jim Monigan, Ardmore
Shipping.

MR. FORAN: Paul Foran, CMR Marine
Consultants.

MR. NUNEZ: Lance Nunez, Dow Chemical.

MR. JOHNSON: Morgan Johnson, Kirby
Corporation.
MS. KELLER-CANON: Diane Keller-Canon.

MR. KEFFLER: Pat Keffler, the Bulk Liquids team leader in ENG-5 of the Hazardous Materials Division. I'm also one of the alternate designated federal officials.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Norman O'Shaughnessy, Stolt Tankers USA.

MS. DOYLE: Margaret Doyle, Eagle LNG Partners.

MR. SALVESON: John Salveson, retired.

MR. ROBERTSON: Joel Robertson, Chevron Phillips.

MR. WILSON: Jamie Wilson, Sector Houston.

MR. HIGGINS: Ben Higgins, ABS Group.

MR. TRAUTMAN: Craig Trautman, GTT North America.

MR. POTKOTTER: Garrison Potkotter, Tricon Energy.

MR. REIMANN: Bob Reimann, CG FAC.

MR. BLAIR: Mike Blair, Coast Guard Headquarters, Office of Standards Evaluation and
Development.

MR. SANDHU: Parmi Sandhu, Marathon Petroleum.

MR. LAMBERT: Paul Lambert, Coastal Link Maritime.

MR. JONES: Aaron Jones, John Zink.

MR. PALO: Chris Palo, Kirby Offshore.

MR. BEALE: Jeff Beale, CH-IV International; we specialize in LNG.

MR. ANDERSEN: Sean Andersen with Dixon.

CDR CARRERO: Eric Carrero,

MR. HICKLER: Rich Hickler, certifying entity.

DR. ZNATI: Dr. Cynthia Znati,

Hazardous Materials Division.

MR. WELLS: Ronald Wells, Shell.

MR. KINDLE: Jeff Kindle, Nordic Tankers.

MR. ARANKE: Naval Aranke, Executive Ship.

MR. HAWN: Robert Hawn, West Gulf
Maritime Association.

MR. GARDNER: Bob Gardner, Barge America.

MR. CLARK: David Clark, Targa Resources.

MR. WOODRING: Marcus Woodring, Port of Houston Authority.

MS. CROSS: Cathi Cross with Phillips.

MR. THOMAS: Ron Thomas, Institute of Makers of Explosives.

MR. BENNETT: Chris Bennett, Intercontinental Terminals Company.

LCDR: Julie Blanchfield, Coast Guard.

MR. PRAZAK: Did we miss anybody?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Very good.

What I'd like to do, if everyone is okay, I'd like to take about a ten-minute break, need to load a presentation up for the subcommittee reports. So I'm showing 10:18, let's say 10:30.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
MR. PRAZAK: We'll go ahead and crank back up so we stay ahead of schedule, not on time, ahead of schedule.

A couple of reminders, has anyone not signed in on the attendance roster? Again, don't forget the card over here on the side; please make sure when you get a chance to sign it for Larry.

And with that, we're going to go ahead and crank up, and the first subcommittee report is going to be Mr. John Temperilli, followed by Margaret Doyle on LNG, and Ms. Ashley on the thermo control systems.

With that, I'll turn it over to John.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Thank you, James, and good morning. John Temperilli with the Center for Toxicology and Environmental Health.

A couple of points of recognition before I begin. Thank you to the subcommittee members who were here and gave of their time, some really good input over two days, realizing that there's a lot we don't know, a lot of
questions to be asked and answered. Special
thanks to Cathi Cross at the back. Thank you,
Cathi, for being in attendance and help driving
some of the discussions. And a recognition to my
counterpart with NMSAC, CAPT Marcus Woodring.
Marc is now, as he said, head of the Port of
Houston Authority, and he's here taking
voluminous notes so that he can report back to
his meeting which will be in April.

So let's move through this. So some
of this I'll be jumping and skipping, but a
reminder of why we're here.

To CAPT Martin, thank you for your
presentation this morning, it was fantastic.

A reminder of why we're here: to
avoid and mitigate potentially grave consequences
upon our citizens and the homeland. And that's
what the Security Subcommittee has been asked to
do.

There's our task statement. We've
been in business for about a year and it's been a
heavy lift to try to really hone down on how
we're going to get to where we're going to get to. But as we move forward with every meeting, every conversation, we are winnowing down and getting into, and the main thrust is the description of task: Assist the Coast Guard in the development of policies and procedures designed to deny the use of hazardous cargo as weapons while they're being transported or stored within the U.S. marine transportation system. And that in a nutshell is what we're after with our short-term, medium-term and long-term efforts.

So I'm not going to go through the entire task statement. This is on Homeport Ports and Waterways, it is in the public part of it, you can access it, it is the update version, and we are good to go on that. So if you want, please, I invite you to take a look at this; if you'd like to get involved on this subcommittee, I encourage you to do so.

So focus and intent. Our five main focal points are the LPG, LNG, anhydrous ammonia,
chlorine and ammonium nitrate. Other dangerous
cargo considerations: acetone, cyanohydrin, EO,
BO, hydrogen chloride, hydrogen cyanide, et
cetera. We'll be look at these. There are lots
of questions that emanate around the CDC list as
it exists owing to logistical considerations and
market play, and we'll talk more about that as we
move on. Waterside safety and security of
vessels and carrying facilities handling EHCs.
National strategy for waterside security of
vessels carrying and facilities handling,
waterside security, seeks to reduce risk -- to
CAPT Martin's point -- reduce risk while
considering all costs and promoting economic
growth. Incorporate EHCs as part of larger all
hazard protection scheme. This is under Section
812(b) of the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of
2010. It also incorporates the intent of the
president's Executive Order 13650, improving
chemical facility safety and security -- more on
that in a bit.

We had a meeting on the 17th, this was
a smaller workgroup. I'm not going to go into a
lot of the detail; these minutes are posted on
the Homeport page, imminently readable. But the
key discussions were alternatives to funding and
information gathering, and the key question
considered here that day was: Can we use the
2011 commodity flow study? Pieces of we can,
pieces of it we will, the chemical descriptors,
some of those pieces, but what we've noticed
since the study was conducted over seven-eight
years, the market has changed. There are new
players in the market, there are consideration of
new chemicals being transported, and there are
new players or realignments in who carries and
where they carry to.

So that's part of our challenge is
define that. We will be creating a matrix to
deal with the following information. And part of
what came out of this, again, with Marc
Woodring's input, was a questionnaire, and we
undertook to determine that it's going to fall to
the subcommittee to figure out very quickly how
we access newer and more up-to-date information

Our first task statement under short-term was consideration of a commodity flow study. Unfortunately, it doesn't look like it's going to happen in a timely manner, so we're going to access information sources, and part of what we've done as a subcommittee is to identify where we can glean that information from, and that's going to be up to us. The challenge is to find it, update it and then make it current.

So these were the questions. Again, these will be posted, I'm not going to go into detail, unless my fearless leader -- where did he step to, where did James go? Anyway, unless I'm directed otherwise by the Commander or James, again, volume shift per year, modality, frequency of shipments, seasonal component to these chemicals, where do they come from, where do they travel, stops along the way. It's the notion that if we're going to harden the target, it's going to create a harder framework so that we deny the potential use or potential access. Much
of this is already in place but we need an update
from the last time this was asked seven-eight-
nine years ago.

Future outlook for the market, another
consideration, and as we do this, we're going to
talk about the workgroups we created because
that's part of the consideration we're looking
at. We noticed the change in seven or eight
years and we noticed that there is a market
change quickly in some sectors. Delmas Jones,
for instance, with Ineos, talking about what
you're currently shipping with ethane.

MR. JONES: Eight years ago we didn't
have ships that were shipping ethane across the
Atlantic, now we've got five, six, seven and
another even coming out, so completely new
industry and it wasn't broken out as a subset of
the regulations.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Right. And we hear
little whispers in the wind about things like
methy alcohol and certain other bulk commodities
that currently aren't being shipped, but the
notion, so we need to look at these and we need
to account for this as we move forward because we
don't want to go another seven or eight years and
suddenly have to revisit this entire perspective.

Commodity flow information, the
questionnaire was generated, it will be modified
as needed, what do we need to know. Access to
information sources extend, and we identified
Marine Exchange, CFATS Appendix 8, high threat
urban area rail, 49 CFR 1580, U.S. Coast Guard
FSP, Customs and Border Protection ACE, trade
associations and Tier 2 reports. We're also
going to try to attempt to leverage Executive
Order 13650 to assist in getting access to some
of these parts and pieces. This is a heavy lift,
that's why the picture of the elephant with the
guy, we got that.

List consideration, EHC/CDC list
consideration. We already know we've got the
five, that's a given, they're not going anywhere.
Now to existing proposed and logistical market
considerations, other chemicals of concern,
packet CDCs, communications to the captain of the
port in regard to chemicals of concern because we
identified that there are blind spots, the
information apparently exists but it's not clear
in certain areas, so that's part of what we've
taken on. And then how to highlight changing
commercial bulk chemical commodities.

The initial working group
designations. Commodity flow study, that will be
the full committee. As we undertake this and we
look at these information sources, that will be
the entire group. We came up with a number of
working groups to try to break this elephant
apart and eat it in small bites. What we came up
with and the other pieces to this notification of
outreach or symposium, my suggestion is that
we're going to create a small list on Homeport
where folks who outreach -- in this case, Chris
Bennett has already done two, the Houston Ship
Channel Security District and some of the
chemical carriers -- and these are occurring but
what we want to do is capture that. Who are we
reaching out to, who are we talking to, so we'll have an offline about that, but the notion is that's also the entire committee. We'll be doing any notice of outreach of symposiums or workgroups, we're going to try to capture that in terms of the security, so moving forward we have a litany of who we've spoken with and maybe leverage some of those conversations.

Advice. Implement the four national strategy goals. I'll show you what those are in a minute, I'm not going to go into detail on those, but those too are on Homeport, they're there, they're listed. These are the four strategies put out by Coast Guard as to where they want to head. That will again be the entire committee.

Now, the especially hazardous committee, certain dangerous cargo, primary, secondary evaluations, Delmas has graciously accepted to take that on, he didn't have enough to do. Best practices, risk management, I put a bunch of names up there: Bennett, Cross,
Pontikos, Johnson, Campbell, O'Shaughnessy --
sounds like a law firm in Boston.

(General laughter.)

MR. TEMPERILLI: They will be helping
assist us. We have Nunez; I forgot, Lance,
you're there as well. And again, these are not
etched in stone except what we talked about
yesterday and we can revisit these.

Advance notice of arrival review.

Johnson and O'Shaughnessy, another smaller firm.
Tracking, Campbell and Johnson. And the
strategies promoting sufficient public-private
resources, Marc is taking that on as NMSAC, and
obviously we'll be sharing what we get with our
NMSAC counterpart.

The strategic goals, again, these are
listed. These four goals, strategic goals, are
listed in this document. Strategy for waterside
security -- this is on Homeport, I'm not going to
belabor the point, they're there, this is what we
seek to support. Are you okay with that? I
don't have to go into detail? Okay.
Quick consideration, I thought this might be a throwaway, I was very quickly corrected, this apparently is going to have wheels. This is Senate Bill 3379, it is being worked on as we speak. The short title is the Surface Transportation and Maritime Security Act. It will affect what we do and how we do it.

Cathi, have you got anything you want to add to that?

MS. CROSS: No. We'll just see where it goes.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Okay, very good. But again, this is a tickler, it's a heads-up. If you haven't read it, please read it. It will affect what we do and how we do it.

A reminder of the front sides. This is what we're at right here, safety and security, again, avoiding and mitigating potentially grave consequences.

Any questions, comments, fan mail, feedback? Have you got anything?

MS. DOYLE: No. Good job.
MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: Konstantin Dimitropoulos with Driftwood.

It looks like you have pretty good coverage on the security aspect. One thing that I didn't see emphasized, not particularly for the Port of Houston but for the other ports, the LNG transportation certificate.

MR. TEMPERILLI: I was going to say I know you guys have a piece and we've talked cross-committee on how that plays into it. And that's a great question because we didn't address it specifically, but I know that when it comes up in your group that there will be some cross-pollination there.

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: But the security aspect --

MS. DOYLE: No, we haven't, because what John is talking about is CDC, and LNG is a fuel is not considered at CDC. That's very important to understand. Again, we're hoping that it will remain that way because it's been carried since 1950 on ships.
MR. TEMPERILLI: I mean, if we want to get off on a brief tangent, a brief tangent is that there have been some considerations on LNG and LBG, but part of our mandate comes from in the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act in 2010 was the congressional interest -- I'm not necessarily going to call it a mandate but essentially as the Coast Guard looks at it, it's a mandate -- and so consideration of LNG as an EHC, as an especially hazardous cargo, I think it's more optics, I think there's a lot of public involvement in that. I'm not saying it's not a dangerous cargo but I am saying that I think the optic load, and Mr. Boudreaux and I spoke yesterday, the three main ones that we're really concerned with as a weaponized issue is ammonium nitrate and anhydrous ammonia and chlorine. But LPG and LNG have been put in that group.

The other thing, and I'll just briefly mention this, we haven't talked about it except in passing, we haven't captured it yet, but the notion that we might mention, at least in passing
in our recommendation documents, something to do with cyber. It's not our forte, it's not our push. Actually, Marc with NMSAC has a standing committee on cyber and what they recommend we're going to look at, but I don't think we can go forward and not mention it at least in passing because there's got to be cyber considerations looking at the strategic goals of the Coast Guard.

Any comment?

MS. DOYLE: Just a followup to that. Back in 2001 after 9/11, we were tasked with looking at creating a CDC list, and as you know, LNG, as it flows given the market, LNG was never even considered because it was its own entity relative to where it went. In Boston it's handled very specifically and that's an import terminal. So we never intended to make LNG a specific CDC, so I'm aware that it could be put in that bucket, but there are other -- and I defer to Cyndi and other experts in the room -- it's important to note that it's not in a vacuum
by itself and I'm not sure it should be. It's not addressed in what John is talking about for a reason.

Believe me, we know that it will come up but I just don't want to short-sight the good work of the LNG community and move it over into that bucket. Does that help anybody?

MR. PRAZAK: LNG as a cargo is a CDC.

MS. DOYLE: Yes.

MR. PRAZAK: But LNG as a fuel is not.

MS. DOYLE: It is not.

MR. PRAZAK: I guess we could ask the LNG workgroup to look at that further. That would give them another year of work to do.

(General talking and laughter.)

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: Of course it's the quantity that can create relative damage. But now we have development of LNG as fuel, we have a few ships that they burn LNG as fuel, we have barges that are delivering LNG to the inland borders and coastal borders. So at least at the market and at some point we have to address it
but then to have to wait on the U.S. Coast Guard
to assign the task.

MS. DOYLE: Right. And that's the
thing. It's a very immature market.

MR. TEMPERILLI: And, Kosa, I
appreciate that, I agree totally. It's come up
in conversation even among our group as to
movement of the use of natural gas in these ships
as far as fuel on transport and then as far as
fuel tenders. I mean, that's all come up.

The notion going forward for us is if
we're going to meet the mandate from the Coast
Guard, we have to be able to identify the gaps,
where are the holes where the captains of the
port zones do not have good visibility. That's a
heavy lift. And the other lift is to figure out
what the commodities are right now but with the
anticipation that the market will change, and
then how do we account for that.

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: The Lake Charles
commander there has a pretty good might say
c��rns or worries or a pretty good
understanding what is happening in Lake Charles.

MR. TEMPERILLI:  Appreciate that.

Thank you.

Anything else?  I'm good.

MR. PRAZAK:  Segue.  Next up, Ms. Margaret Doyle.

MS. DOYLE:  That's one thing is LNG is a fuel, it's not considered a CDC.  Let's face it, in 2001 no one heard of the term hydraulic fracturing.

Good morning.  Again, my name is Margaret Kaigh Doyle.  I'm the chairman of the LNG Fuels Subcommittee.

One of the things that I think is great is the acronyms that re on the back of your attendance sheet.  Have you seen those?  There's just one missing, I'll spell it out for you, it's G.O.A.T, and that's Tom Brady.

(General laughter.)

MS. DOYLE:  Again, the LNG Fuels Subcommittee, we've been going for, believe it or not, almost four years now.  When we started, I
mean, you talk about the elephant on top of the
back, our laundry list was pretty big, and we've
been able to kind of whittle it down, but Kosa
just mentioned, here we go. We do know that
that's going to be an issue, it's just that I'm
of the opinion from a security standpoint the
different scenarios that we have to look at a
risk assessment -- and I'll talk about one of the
deliverables relative to that, that we delivered
last March -- it's such a new industry, we don't
understand what we understand right now.

And I agree, but you can't foresee the
type of transfer of LNG fuel, you have to kind of
let it form and then we can look at the security
aspects. And trust me, it's a very secure
industry, and the lessons from the LNG cargo
industry are being transferred to the LNG fuels
industry.

Update tasking. Again, one of the
things, as John was good enough to set the stage
for, I want to say some thank yous. This is a
lot of work, and Cyndi Znati and the Commander
have done a fantastic job. Having everything on the Homeport, having everything so just ready for us when we come in to do the good work. Really, again, this is a very new industry and it's been great that I can say, hey, can you take a look at this, this is now on Homeport. It is such a great reference, and Julie, you've done a great job, thank you.

Our task title. When we started, we really didn't even know what to. It was such a new, Harvey Gulf was the only game in town when we really started this whole effort.

Recommendations on safety standards for the design of vessels carrying natural gas or using natural gas as fuel. We put the last caveat of fuel in there because you're going to have an LHG which is a liquified hazardous gas, that could be a barge that's a cargo or a fuel, so that's kind of why we couched it like that.

The recommendation way back when when we met in Washington in 2013, basically through subcommittee meetings, workgroup meetings,
correspondence, we want to give CTAC the best
tools to look at this emerging industry as LNG
fuel, the emerging propulsion fuel, and that was
kind of how we started it. The task itself is on
Homeport, it's very detailed. We still have some
outstanding tasks that have kind of been OBE,
overaken by events, but I want to talk to you
about the work we've done and the work that's
ahead of us.

Last March was kind of crazy, the fact
that we delivered four deliverables, and I tell
people they're all on Homeport now, they're just
great reports that really have been help to the
industry, and I try to get them out to as many
people as I can. Again, we're a very new
industry and we're trying to figure out how we
work together and how we kind of move forward
together. But one of the things was we looked at
portable fuel tanks, and that's going to be
incorporated in Tim Meyers's. He's updating his
guidance on how to submit design recommendations
for LNG fuel vessels, and right now, because he
can't get it through with the regulatory hold, he incorporated some of that into his latest policy letter which apparently cannot come out yet. But that's based on the new IGF. The IGF, as you know, took effect 1 January 2017. Bill Hutchins from Shell and Tony Teo did a great job at really looking at where the holes were in the IGF Code for looking at portable LNG fuel tanks.

We did a SIMOPS risk assessment, John Rhinehart from ABS did a great job on this, basically said, okay, we know SIMOPS is a big issue, I know the Coast Guard is trying to put a SIMOPS policy letter out there right now, it's still in the process, it's still in the pipeline. Right, Cyndi, the SIMOPS? So it hasn't come out.

DR. ZNATI: It's still on Ken Smith's desk.

MS. DOYLE: So what we did in lack of having some guidance, we put together a SIMOPS, a risk assessment guide, that really if you get a chance go to Homeport, take a look at it, it's a great document.
The Non-FERC guidance for waterfront facilities, again, what you're seeing emerging here are smaller scale projects involving LNG as a fuel, and what's out there right now is what they call 33 CFR 127 for waterway suitability assessment, and that's for really big based import projects for when the U.S. was importing big volumes of LNG. Well, that's a changing landscape, as we know.

So what we did, there was a NVIC 111 that tells you how to do that. The NVIC 111 really doesn't apply. So what we did was we created our own guidance, kind of like a template for changing NVIC 111 for a smaller scale facility, and again, as these smaller facilities emerge around the United States, this is a great document. Again, it's on Homeport, you just go to Homeport CTAC, and it's right there.

The last thing we did was we looked at where you put tanks for gas-fueled vessels relative to controlled spaces and accommodations. Dan West did a great job with that. In the
recommendations we kind of tightened it up, and
it's a great tool if you're looking at where can
I put an LNG tank on a gas-fueled vessel.

So again, these are four deliverables
we got approved by CTAC last year, so we kind of
restarted with two new outstanding tasks, and
we'll probably have a few more, but right now we
tabled a few and we have two outstanding ones.

Our current subcommittee taskings.

Develop a set of recommendations for design
 specifications for monitoring and control systems
for unmanned cargo and bunkering LSG barges.
You're going to see bunkering barges, this is
becoming a fuel, it's not going away because of
IMO 2020, you're going to have more LNG-fueled
vessels or dual-fueled vessels coming here and
that's going to involve a tug and a barge. And
what we had to do, and it was kind of a
brainchild of a couple of the LNG Subcommittee
members, is how do we address this, how do you
control the barge, if the barge is on a wire, if
it's an ATV.
So we kind of looked at that, and then we talked to the Towing Safety Advisory Committee and they're doing something similar, so they came to us. And we were just kind of whispering about this two years ago, but TSAC came to us, came to Cyndi and said, hey, we'll do the operational part, can you look at the design part at CTAC, so that's what we started. It's very early on. Dan West and Kevin Storm have developed a strong plan of how we're going to address the design of this for the monitoring and control of these LSG barges.

So it's very early on. If you want, there's a copy of the latest drawing, that's on Homeport. So it's very early on, we really have to tighten it up and figure out, there will be subgroups within that, the way they're usually is when you have a big project like that, but it's very important to understand that the control and the monitoring of these LNG-fueled barges and these LSG barges, it's important and it needs to be addressed. So that's kind of one of the
issues we're running with in 2017.

And the other one is a matrix. When
we first started this group, everybody was
talking about -- because Harvey Gulf was one of
the first ones to do it, they're using Type C on
theirs -- everything was Type C and it's a great
technology but there wasn't enough information
regarding membrane and A&B tanks, and put a
little line in each one of those boxes, and I
think it's a ten-page document, is there a
reference, is there a reference in the CFR, is
there a reference IBC Code, and what we're seeing
is a lot of times in the A&B for the CFRs,
there's nowhere to go. And not good or bad, it's
just the change in technology.

And Tony actually made a good point in
his last slide yesterday and said, hey, here's
the newer technologies, things are changing. And
I have to really point out that in these LNG
Subcommittee meetings there's a lot of brain
matter, there's a lot of smart people in this
room, and it's just a pleasure to listen to these
people say well, that's not true, and there's no egos. And to be able to say we're going to put this together, I can honestly say that I don't think there's anybody that's looking at this as closely as we are. It's making sure the playing ground is just level for everyone because you have to understand there's more than Type C out there.

So that's what we've kind of created. Again, it's early on in the process is, it's a lot of work. Bob Kamb yesterday volunteered to help out with this. So these are our two existing, we have some other ones that have been tabled, so these are pretty big action items to undertake, so this will probably take about a year to get this done, but it's very important and it's very important to our very young industry in the LNG fuels industry.

We do have Sean Andersen and the gentleman from CH-IV. Sean Andersen brought this up that CH-IV was awarded the research work for looking at exclusion zone and vapor source
modeling tools, what's working. And Sean brought it up and because it's an ongoing -- and Sean, what is the date for that? That's upcoming when they have to kind of get that put together. Right?

MR. KAMB: I think when I looked at the FNSA site, I'm thinking that the deliverable was somewhere around mid summer or somewhere like that.

MS. DOYLE: And Sean brought this up yesterday and it was brand new to the group, but if you know anything about trying to get exclusion zones and vapor source modeling done for smaller scale LNG, this is a very great opportunity for our group. So what I decided to do was we will go ahead and we will put CH-IV in contact with the members of the LNG Subcommittee and they will respond. But this is such a great opportunity to have PHMSA say, wow, the current exclusion zones don't apply to what you're trying to do. And for anyone to try to do this work, that is a game-changer for us.
So what we've done, because we're CTAC we can't say, oh, CTAC recommends this. What we're going to do is we're going to distribute the information for CH-IV to all the members and they can respond, and they'll get back to us and we'll keep everyone updated. I think that's the best we can do given the nature of its PHMSA work but it's CH-IV that's doing the research for them.

Any questions on that?

(No response.)

MS. DOYLE: The other we looked at is examine any risks during transfer of LNG between LNG tanks Type C and low pressure Type B. Again, it has to do with the difference of the technology, and you have your Type C tank and you're going to have the emergence of membrane tanks which could be a Type B and it's a difference in pressures, and you're going to have some loss of cargo, there could be some issues.

We were very concerned that this was a commercial issue, but we realize it's important
and we looked at this and said this is happening. The GTT barge will be online this year, they will be transferred from a Type C to a lower pressure vessel type, so how do we get this done? And luckily, LT McAllen was in the back of the room and said, I realize things can move slowly if you try to go through the regulatory, the policy letter route, have CTAC contact me. So I'm going to give him any of the information I've gleaned from the last three or four meetings and reach out to people that have concerns about this issue and the LNG NCOE is going to try to issue some sort of a policy guide, a field guide for this. We think it's the best way to go about it as opposed to having it go through the entire process for let's get a policy letter out, to go through the different parts of headquarters.

So this is a best option now. If NCOE comes out and says this is big, it needs to be something that's more of a form of regulatory approach, that's fine, but this is what we decided yesterday as a subcommittee is the best
way to go.

Our next LNG Subcommittee meetings, again, given everything -- I know this looks like two pretty simple tasks but there's a lot to do with the CAMS and the ABC matrix, I like to call it, so what we decided to do is collocate an April meeting between ABS Washington and Houston. The reason I don't have it on the slide there is because as you Coast Guard personnel know, you can't use Skype, you can't share screens. So what we've decided to do is have ABS Washington have something via Skype or Go To Meeting and we could have people in both of those offsite locations and we could share screens, save a little bit on the travel budget, that way the Coast Guard people can be there. So that was we felt a good alternative to move forward on these pretty important projects.

Q223, we're going to do whatever is in conjunction with the CTAC full meeting, and we have a lot of conference calls with working groups, sub-tasking groups, and that's as needed
and those pop up a lot as we realize, okay, here's another technical issue but it's not a game-changer. And they're great about letting me know about them and they argue amongst themselves and come back with usually some pretty great recommendations. So that's kind of how we've been running since we started.

Questions, that's me, that's Cyndi and that's Julie. Again, thank you so much. Thanks for humoring me with the Tom Brady reference. If you have any questions, do not hesitate, but again, I cannot stress enough, the people we have in these rooms for the LNG, it's a very emergent industry and we have all the players there and it makes all the difference.

Thank you. Any questions?

MR. MONIGAN: Yeah, I have a quick question. I'm sorry. Jim Monigan from Ardmore Shipping.

What is the only team that has beaten Tom Brady in the Super Bowl?

(General laughter.)
MS. DOYLE: That would be the New York Giants.

MR. PRAZAK: How many times did that occur?

MS. DOYLE: Twice.

But thank you so much. And again, I really appreciate the opportunity.

Norman.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Norman O'Shaughnessy, Stolt Tanker.

Being a New Yorker, is he going to retire this year?

MS. DOYLE: I don't think so.

CAPT IBSEN: Is he coming over to your house for dinner?

MS. DOYLE: He let me in on traffic one time on the Mass Pike.

(General laughter.)

MR. TEMPERILLI: I had one add-on to make, if I could. I wanted to thank Ron Thomas from IME, thanks for coming in all week and presenting on the Institute of Makers of
Explosives.

MR. PRAZAK: Next up, Ashley Castle-
Carpenter.

CDR HILBERT: Comment period?

MR. PRAZAK: I'm sorry. Give me one
minute. I'm sorry, I didn't look at my agenda.

We actually have a break here for public comment
so let me turn out to the public and see if
anyone has anything they'd like to present to the
committee at this point. Anyone on the left
side? Back? Anyone on the right side?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. We will
continue. We also had a break scheduled in here
but since we just took one a few minutes ago,
we're going to roll through it. So next up we
have Ms. Ashley Castle-Carpenter, and we have co-
chairs on this committee with also Mr. Jon Young,
but Ashley is presenting today for the committee.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: Ashley Castle-
Carpenter with Aura Engineering, as James
mentioned, co-chair with Jon Young.
I apologize. Despite living in Houston for seven years and the allergy medicine, it's still getting me.

Well, it's not as exciting as security or LNG, but the VCS Subcommittee is a very exciting one for us. Whenever we put the VCS Subcommittee together, we thought it wouldn't last very long and we would just do our two things and be done with it, but it's kind of been like a house remodel on an older house. The more we dig into it, the more things we find, we've found some plumbing issues, some electrical issues, some water damage, so the more we dig into it, the more stuff we find to fix.

This week we have really done some work and we really appreciate all of our subcommittee helpers, the experts we had come in. We had a very exciting conversation with some fabricators and manufacturers. And Jon Young was a great slavedriver, he really kept us on task, so because he worked so hard, we have three final reports to submit today, not as impressive as
four. But we really worked hard this week and we really appreciate all the input and everybody worked till five o'clock both days, so it was a lot.

So our task is 15-01, it is Marine VCS Program Review and Update. Our two primary tasks were to update the CE Guidance and draft recommendations to supplement the publication and implementation of the final rule. Those are very broad on purpose so that we could have a lot of flexibility with what we've done, and like I said, it's been like a house remodel, we just keep finding more things the more we get into it.

A little bit of background. Many of you know the first vapor control system regulations were published in 1990. The new regulations were published in 2013 but took the old regs, they took a lot of clarifications, they took a lot of exemption requests and compiled them into one document. There are a few new things that snuck in so all the new regulations clarified a lot of things, and a lot more
flexibility with less exemptions, it also brought some new issues, and those are those house remodeling issues we find.

Again, we have two tasks. The first one, in addition to that 1990 official regulation, there was a guidance document in 1991 that came out, and it's the Certifying Entity Guidelines for Conducting Review Certification and Initial Inspection of Waterside Facility Vapor Control Systems. So that document helped answer a lot of common questions. In 1991, nobody had certified a system. We were trying to understand the regulations and figure out what the heck was going on. It was a really great document and it really helped, but whenever the regulations came out in 2013, Subpart P, we had these new things, we had some items from Subpart E that had been incorporated into regulation. So that 1991 document was a little obsolete so ENG-5 asked us to review it and update it so that it was more applicable to the Subpart P.

Our task two referencing the
implementation and interpretation of the VCS rule. There were a whole bunch of exemptions coming into ENG-5. They were getting probably 30 to 50 a month on the same thing over and over again. So they asked us to come in, make recommendations. We submitted a formal report in March 2016, it was approved by CTAC and then it was published. There were three recommendations in our report; two of the three were taken, one of them was not taken. To move things along a little more quickly, there were questions, so that third item is still on our list to try to get clarified with the policy. Right now we're tabling it because we have other things that we feel are more effective for our time.

That policy letter also referenced a list of acceptable anti-flashback burners, and this list will be posted on Homeport. The criteria for acceptable burners doesn't exist, there are no commandant accepted burners right now, so one of the things we did this week was we helped develop some recommendations for the
acceptance of these burners. So again, we have
our primary task and sub-tasks keep coming in
underneath each.

So updating the CE guidance,
certifying entity. We have a spreadsheet we put
together. We thought Delmas had a great idea, so
we put the regulations, we found the Subpart E
analogous CE guidance clarification, and then we
took that as a beginning point and then we made a
recommendation for updating the Subpart P. So we
made it a nice spreadsheet so you can easily
access it. Previous versions were like reading a
CFR, you'd just have to go down the column and
pray you find something.

The second sub-task, Clarify
additional requirement for Type II Detonation
Arresters. This goes under the CE guidance
because there's an appendix, it's Appendix A, and
there's some wording in there that says it's a
guideline and then it says examples of, there are
no specific requirements, so we felt that it was
important to clarify these in the guidance so
that all the CEs had the same information.

Our second task clarification and implementation, our two sub-tasks right now, develop recommendations for the accepted anti-flashback burners -- again ties back into that policy letter -- and then develop revisions to CTAC recommendations for the PRV settings.

That's that third item from the policy letter that was published. So one to supplement policy letter, and then one to get back that third item that we had recommended but didn't go through.

We've been so active. So March 2016, that final report was submitted, policy letter was published. July 2016 we started working on the certified entity guidance. And right away we weren't that productive at first and we had to figure out what we were going to do. So one of our tasks and goals was how are we going to make this the most effective. What we decided to do was an online spreadsheet so all of the people in the subcommittee that were involved could go in, put in their comments, and we could all read each
other's comments, and instead of arguing back and forth, emails and phone calls, we were all able to see them, think through them, and it really worked out very well. We were really impressed by how effective we were, and that's why we were able to finish this week was because we had all of that. We know everybody is busy so you could do it at your leisure when you're drinking your coffee in your boxers on Saturday morning -- I mean, not me, I don't drink coffee.

(General laughter.)

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: So in September we also updated our priorities that reflected our sub-tasks, that is, we finalized some of the items so we were able to focus on the ones we hadn't finalized this week. That spreadsheet I mentioned, starting really July to February this year, we worked on it, shared it online. We were able to go back, revisit, make some clarifications and really dig into things like we needed to.

So this week, as I mentioned, three
final reports. So we have made some recommendations
for anti-flashback burner acceptance guidance, a
final report for the certifying entity
guidelines, a final report for the additional
safety measures required for Type II detonation
arresters. Don't worry, I'm going to tell you
guys all about them, it's very exciting. One of
my main functions at work is to do training for
vapor control systems, and so I get very excited
about detonation arresters, they're my favorite.

We do have some tasks remaining, as I
said, found some plumbing issues. There were
some things that we ran into that we felt we
really needed to bring in more experts, we needed
to do more research, that we just could not
solidify them, and we needed to figure out
they're beyond the task statement that we have.
And so the three things we found were alkylene
oxide requirements, pyrophoric iron sulfide
requirements, and the emergency cargo shutoff
valves. You guys will hear all about that next
time after we have really have time to dig into
it so I won't waste too much time.

One of the first reports, it does tie
into the certifying entity guidance, but ENG-5
asked us to do a formal report because it would
be shorter, they could easily access it without
having to go through the 40 tabs on the CE
guidance document.

So a little bit about detonation
arresters for those of you that don't know. A
detonation arrester is a passive device, it's
required in all marine vapor control systems that
handle flammable, combustible or high flashpoint
vapors. Generally, there's one, often two are
required. A detonation arrester has a whole
bunch of surface area, it's able to quench a
flame, it's able to break up a pressure wave from
even a supersonic detonation. So it's very, very
exciting, like we have cool videos and stuff that
I can't show you.

But the detonation arresters have to
be accepted by the Coast Guard, but they have to
go through all of this testing. Appendix A of
154 is a guidance document for the acceptance.
The whole thing is to move that into something
more formal, but it's been 20-ish years.

So Appendix A defines two types of
DAs. A Type I is acceptable for stationary
flames. It can be a two-hour burn time. Type
II, 15-minute burn time, but it requires
additional safety measures. So these additional
safety measures are what we discussed this week
and developed the recommendations for. So ENG-5
said, Hey, can you guys make some
recommendations? And we went through, like I
said, we had several industry people in, we had
engineers, we had ENG-5, and we had a really good
discussion.

In the regulations it doesn't require
a Type I or a Type II in any particular instance,
so we had a really good discussion about that.
We determined there's no ideal place for either
one as long as you have the appropriate safety
equipment. What further methods are most common
applications? So if you have Type II, there are further required and we discussed what is the most common, that being a temperature sensor and a quick-closing valve. And then where should these methods be in place? So those are things you can find in the report on Homeport.

Again, our second final report, certifying entity guidance. That first one we tied into what we wrote into this guidance document, but this one has about 40 tabs on it, it breaks down each and every main section. So again, we used Subpart E to make Subpart P clarifications. We broke it down so it was easy to find for everybody. You guys can read all this on Homeport. This is just a basic example of what we did do. We actually put the verbiage in there so you don't have to go back and forth. We had some clarifications that we proposed initially, taking Subpart E, our comments, and then the final clarification we ended up with green, that means we accepted it and we thought it was a great idea.
So the final thing that we did, again related back to that policy letter for accepting anti-flashback burners, and apparently the acronym reduction team was failing us and Julie made up a new one, AFBs. Anti-flashback burners are burners used in a vapor combustion unit. They're designed to maintain a safer system, basically. We're trying to get the flame to not go from inside the stack back into the vapor piping.

As I mentioned, the policy letter does talk about anti-flashback burners being accepted by the commandant and they have to have a safety staff, and again, there are no current requirements for these. There's nothing published, it's all taken on a case-by-case basis based off of performance before and things like that and industry standards.

Julie got some cool pictures. So as a side note, detonation arresters are basically flame arresters but with four of these sections instead of just one section. You can see there's
some corrugated steel in there and that gives it that more surface area so we don't have that flashback. But the one on the right is kind of an old used one so they're much prettier than that when they're new.

MR. PRAZAK: They're otherwise known as dust collectors.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: That's a great paperweight.

Our general recommendations were based off of the industry standards what's been approved, what's been performing for the last 20-something years, and that's how we determined our recommendations. There were some flame arrester requirements listed in the regulations and it was an ASTM 1273 and UL 525. There are no flame arresters that meet those requirements, and they're not able to and it's not economical to test them and it would be a very huge burden to industry to even try to meet that requirement, so we decided to go with what's proven, what's been working for the last 26 years.
It's a flame arresting style, has a metal crimped ribbon like that picture you saw. We recommended an inspection every five years because the ones that are going to fail are the ones that have not been inspected properly, they have some tunneling from corrosion or maybe somebody took a crowbar to it because they felt like it was a good idea.

And then we also made some recommendations for what the manufacturers should supply to get their burners onto the list, so it was things like design drawings, flows, materials and construction, things like that, so if somebody offered us something that was made out of PVC, we would be like, yeah, I don't think that's going to work.

We do feel that doing this acceptance is going to be a lot less burden on industry and a lot less burden on ENG-5 because they're having to constantly approve all of these burners on, again, a case-by-case basis. It's how many, Julie, like for 2015?
Lcdr Blanchfield: I think we did like 25 just in anti-flashback burners last year.

Ms. Castle-Carpenter: Every vapor combuster that gets put in has to have this exemption right now, and so we get to put these in, it takes 25, at least. As industry picks up, we have more of those.

And the basic idea is you have the USCG issues a manufacturer acceptance letter and it covers all of those model numbers of that same design and if they have any changes, they have to go back through review.

Again, everybody really worked hard and we learned a lot. It was very nerdy exciting for us to have all of these industry people have healthy discussions.

Does anybody have any questions?

Mr. Prazak: Don't leave.

Ms. Castle-Carpenter: Oh, you have three things to vote on.

Mr. Prazak: Let me ask a quick question first, these are going to into policy
letters and then eventually regulation, or will
they go into proposed rule and then to final

            DR. ZNATI: This guidance will be like
the 1991 guidance.

            MR. PRAZAK: Okay. So it's just going
to be guidance.

            LCDR BLANCHFIELD: Well, this one on
the anti-flashback burners, we're not sure what
the final will look like, we're just going to
take these recommendations.

            DR. ZNATI: This one is kind of in the
policy letter what we said we would provide that
we have not yet, so this one the policy letter
has already been published.

            MR. YOUNG: Jon Young, Warner
Nicholson.

            Our goal here was to develop a
criteria for the Coast Guard to evaluate anti-
flashback burners so as new burners came to the
market, they would have something to compare it
to, to say yes, this is a Coast Guard accepted
burner or no, it is not. So these are guidelines
that the Coast Guard can use to say, the
subcommittee put together what we felt like was
important as a criteria for the design of
burners.

MS. DOYLE: So if someone calls and
says I have a question about whether this is
accepted, Julie just referenced Homeport to them
for now?

LCDR BLANCHFIELD: Correct.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: Well, as soon
as this is published.

MR. PRAZAK: How would they publish
it? Either it has to come out as a policy or as
regulation or something.

CDR HILBERT: So the Coast Guard will
have to take this recommendation and we'll have
to decide on how we're going to publish that.

MS. DOYLE: Oh, okay. But it will be
on Homeport for a reference.

MR. YOUNG: There was a gap in the
policy letter that was written because it said
these flame arrester burners will be listed on
Homeport as to which ones were acceptable. They
didn't know exactly what constitutes an
acceptable burner.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: So we developed
guidelines for them to accept them and then
they'll have to accept them, and then they get on
the list.

CDR HILBERT: But this report that
you're seeing, should the committee agree to
submit it to the Coast Guard, would be published
on Homeport.

LCDR BLANCHFIELD: Yes.

MR. PRAZAK: Any other questions,
either from the committee itself or from the
audience, the public?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: So we have a request to
approve the three submissions from the VCS group.
Are you okay taking those as one group? Is
everyone okay with doing that, or do you want to
keep them individual? Okay to do it as one
group? Okay. I'm going to propose it as one
group.

So what we've got is the motion that I'd like to put out on the table is to accept this final report on anti-flashback burner standards recommendations. There's a secondary document here which is the recommended updates to the certifying entity guidance document for Subpart P. And then there's a third one here which is the Type II detonation arrester additional safety measures recommendations. And then the enclosure goes with those. Right?

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: That enclosure is the certifying entity document.

MR. PRAZAK: So anyway, the recommendation is that these three reports plus this attachment are to get approval from the committee to forward those on to the Coast Guard as final products. Do I have a first?

MR. JONES; So moved.

MR. PRAZAK: Delmas Jones for a first.

Do I have a second?

MR. TEMPERILLI: Second.
MR. PRAZAK: John Temperilli seconds.

Any discussion before we go to vote, questions, comments from the committee?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Any questions or comments from the public before we move on?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. So for the committee members, all in favor of accepting the three reports plus the attachment for forwarding on to the Coast Guard as final reports, if you approve that, please raise your hand and say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. PRAZAK: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. Motion carries. Thank you.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: Thanks, guys.

(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: We have another slot here for public comment as well. Anyone from the public that would like to ask any questions or
make any comments at this point? I'll look left, circle around to center, anybody there? No. Right side?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. This was our planned lunch break, but is everyone okay with proceeding on? Anyone not okay proceeding on? Okay. We're going to keep rolling on.

So with that, what we want to do is get into the other items of interest. First on the agenda is Pat Keffler.

MR. KEFFLER: It still morning. Good morning, everyone. I don't imagine that my comments will take more than 75 to 90 minutes.

(General laughter.)

MR. KEFFLER: Since the last advisory committee meeting, the major activity at IMO was the fourth meeting of the Pollution Prevention Response Subcommittee which was in January, a few months ago, a month or so ago. The work there that has the most impact on this group is done by the Evaluation for Safety and Pollution Hazards
working group, the ESPH. They had a couple of
agenda items that they touched base on. The big
one is and the continuing work is the amendments
that they're making to the IBC Code and the
various products that could be carried as a bulk
liquid.

I guess before I get to the
amendments, one of the items that they also do is
kind of go through the tripartites each time.
There are a number of the provisionally assessed
products that are going to expire at the end of
this year. There are two List One products,
chemicals, three List Four pollution only trade
name mixture products, and 36 List Three trade
name products that are expiring. Nine of those
are U.S. submitted products and those are divided
up amongst five companies. We've reached out to
those five companies. I believe one of them
we're going to let expire, but we'll be working
with those companies to have those products added
to the permanent all countries no expiry list at
the next ESPH meeting.
As far as the IBC Code amendments -- and I will ask Soren and Norm O'Shaughnessy to chime in if they've got anything additional to add on this -- the major work has been focused on finishing up the Chapter 21 revision of the IBC Code. Chapter 21 is the guidance for how we go about assessing products and what the carriage requirements will be based on those assessments. This is follow-on work to the 2007 amendment to the IBC Code which really worked on the pollution aspect side. The work that we're doing now is trying to capture the safety aspects for all of the 800 or so cargos that are in Chapter 17 and 18 of the IBC Code.

They are by and large done in the group with Chapter 21. There are a couple of little odds and ends that they need to figure out, but the real work, now that they've completed the process chapter, is going back through the other 800 products that have been assessed and kind of validating the carriage requirements for them.
One in particular that we had a paper on that was submitted by DGAC is on methyl alcohol. Methyl alcohol is carried in fairly high volume worldwide. Heretofore, methyl alcohol has always been carried as primarily a pollution only cargo, it obviously has a low flashpoint, so there are fire safety hazards, but under the new Chapter 21 guidance, methyl alcohol would pick up toxicity requirements for carriage. That would have a fairly big impact on industry, so we've looked at ways to either tweak the process without kind of invalidating all the work that's been done, or look at using some sort of expert reasoning, experience and expertise with moving methyl alcohol to validate carrying it the way we currently are so that we're not adding a bunch of extra requirements.

Soren, do you have anything to add on that? I know it was Mike's paper.

CAPT IBSEN: No. We're still working on submitting, DGAC is working on submitting another paper in October, and working in concert
with the Methanol Institute to try to come up
with safety data and inhalation data and whatnot
to try to make that case to lessen the burden on
methanol carriage in the future. I'm not sure
how successful we'll be, but you can never
predict what happens at IMO. But you're doing a
good recap. Thank you.

MR. KEFFLER: To just touch on
intercessionally before the next ESPH meeting,
Norway reached out to the U.S., the UK, I believe
South Africa chimed in, to essentially push
through these 800 products that are in Chapter
17, go through the assessment process and redline
the delta between the existing carriage
requirements and what the new carriage
requirements are going to be. So we're each
taking on about 200 or so of those products and
reviewing them.

The companion piece to Chapter 21 is
MEPC-1, Circular 51 which is the bible for doing
tripartite agreements, it's the provisional
assessment process. So we've also been working
on that document to clarify how we go about
meeting the new Chapter 21 standards in
developing tripartite agreements moving forward.

Additional work done by the ESPH
working group which was near and dear to my
heart, maybe less so to this group, was to assess
and create two entries for offshore supply vessel
contaminated bulk liquids. We move a lot of
those. Before they were always moved in barges
back into facilities. Now these flow-back or
back-loaded cargoes are typically being put on
OSVs. Each of those require individual cargo
authorizations and the bulk liquids team is
typically carrying the weight for doing each of
these, wind up doing a couple, two or three or
four of them a week.

Another item that we’re continuing to
work on, and maybe near and dear to John
Salvesen’s heart, is this continued conundrum
between the dividing line between Annex I and
Annex II products, and I think even Mike Blair
will wind up touching on this a little bit when
he discusses the HAZSUB twins rulemaking project.

You know, obviously there are a lot of products
that are carried as oils domestically in the
U.S., carried as chemicals internationally,
there's a little bit of back and forth on that.
I think it's similar to what Ashley said with the
vapor control, the more we look into it, the more
complicated it gets.

And the guidance that I have from Mr.
Lantz on Annex I versus Annex II is to just wade
in very carefully on it because we have a number
of laws that I can't do much about at an IMO
meeting, and we want to be very careful that I
don't support, as a U.S. position, something that
contradicts something that's in U.S. law, U.S.
code. And that's a tough one to dance around
sometimes, especially as a chemical engineer I
see everything as a chemical and many things are
defined as oil.

I think the final item that I would
talk on about the ESPH group is another one that
we've still had trouble coming up with a
definitive answer on, and it's really a regional North Sea issue, and this is the cargo residues and tank washing discharges of high viscosity and persistent floating products. So you have vessels that are following MARPOL Annex II, they're doing their tank washings per their procedures and arrangements manual and they're discharging some of these heavy paraffin, sometimes it's a veg oil or other type of product like that, it hits the cold water of the North Sea, it solidifies and then floats to a beach in the UK or in Norway.

They rightfully are unhappy about the pollution aspects related to that, but at the same time, the vessels were following the rules appropriately. So we're trying to find an answer that. I think that what they're really going to wind up doing is looking at it as a regional issue, put in some sort of a special area and look at a few specific cargoes. The worldwide group is concerned that suddenly everybody who carries veg oil anywhere will find themselves
having to retain tank washings and take them to a reception facility that may or may not exist in the Philippines or somewhere in a more temperate climate where MARPOL Annex II works well as it currently works.

The final item I'd talk about from the Pollution Prevention and Response Subcommittee is that we finished up the draft of the offshore supply vessel chemical code for carrying these types of products on OSVs. The draft will be submitted up to the Marine Safety Committee and the Marine Environmental Protection Committee, hopefully to be forwarded on and be accepted as a non-mandatory code, at least in its first edition, in the next two or three years, and then they will seek having that become a full mandatory code sometime in the future.

And that ends my presentation, and I'd be happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

MR. PRAZAK: Any questions?

(No response.)
MR. KEFFLER: Great. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: Commander, you're up.

CDR HILBERT: Still morning. Good morning, everyone. CDR Patrick Hilbert.

I thought I'd just give an update on some potential regulatory projects that are near and dear to this committee's heart. There is an ongoing regulatory project that was initiated based on a recommendation from Delmas's group, about five years ago at this point, related to updating 46 CFR, Subchapter 30, Table D, 25 TAC 1, a list of flammable/combustible cargoes, and then also Part 150 that has chemical compatibility tables, and then there's another table in 153 46 CFR. That's been an ongoing regulatory project since that time.

There was a notice of proposed rulemaking a number of years ago, comments were received from the public, a number of CTAC members, and so we're approaching the final rule stage and currently that resides within Coast
Guard Headquarters. There is a regulatory pause based on the change in administrations. That certainly has put that on hold, and that was slowly moving its way through Coast Guard legal review. So that one still pends so I thought it was fair to just circle back with this group, at least to Delmas, because a lot of work was put into that.

That's where that stands, so that's at a standstill at the moment but certainly something that's at the top of the list of priorities for myself and Pat, just in our responsibilities within the ENG-5 suite as something that we're continuing. As soon as an opportunity presents itself, we'll be working as hard as we can to move that forward. Certainly we would love to see updated tables in the CFRs to make life for industry and Coast Guard and other stakeholders a little easier with something to work with.

On that note, another potential regulatory project, read a letter from ADM Thomas
thanking Delmas Jones for his work. In the fall of 2016 there was a report submitted to the Coast Guard through CTAC related to updating 46 CFR, Table 1, and incorporating some changes at the IMO level that changed the pollution categories from XYZ to ABC. For those of you that are familiar with that, Delmas' group did a great job and detailed recommendations that have been provided to the Coast Guard, myself and Pat, we turned around and have initiated a regulatory project to move forward on that and updating Table 1 of Part 153 so that it's actually reflects the international requirements that the rest of the world and actually U.S. flagged shipping operating outside of our territorial waters need to adhere to. So that has started that journey, if you will, but right now that is also on hold.

One other regulatory project in my shop that we're working on, it's in Dr. Znati's world, there's an updated IGC Code, and we're taking that into looking at 46 CFR 154 and
potentially updating that to harmonize in certain parts with the international requirements. And as part of that too, potentially looking at addressing the fact that there is not currently regulations for non-self-propelled vessels carrying liquid hazardous gases.

I can't really say too much about those ongoing regulatory projects, but I am happy to take any questions on the three that I mentioned or any other ones. I certainly would do my best to answer anyone's questions on the committee or in the public.

MR. PRAZAK: James Prazak with Tricon.

On the projects that are somewhat put on hold because of the executive order, does that mean that wherever they were in the process they freeze and there's no more work on them, or if they're still in the developmental phase, do those get to continue to be worked on but they just can't hit the Federal Register to go out for public comment and implementation?

CDR HILBERT: I'm going to pass it
over to Mike Blair who works with me at Coast Guard Headquarters.

          MR. BLAIR: I'm Mike Blair. I work in the regulatory development shop, and that's a great question. We have been given a lot of guidance over the last few weeks since January 20, and I would mention that I think there's going to be a lot more guidance coming out in the next several weeks and months.

          But specifically to your question, we have been given guidance by the Department of Homeland Security not to publish any regulations to the office of the Federal Register but to continue working on the development of the regulations within our specific agencies within the Coast Guard. So regulatory development is still ongoing but there is a lot of activity going on with respect to regulations, whether existing or developing regulations.

          It may be worthwhile just to take a moment or two, if I could. Again, there's a lot of stuff about regulatory rollback. I didn't see
the President's talk to Congress and I don't want
to get into politics, but nonetheless, I think
that was part of what he talked about. But I
think there's three or four documents that may be
worthwhile for you to be aware of in the plethora
of information that's being put out there in the
media.

So the first one I'd recommend you
take a look at is the memo from Reince Priebus,
the assistant to the President and chief of
staff, on the 20th of January, entitled
"Regulatory Freeze Pending Review." That's known
as the Priebus memo. And then after that came on
the 30th of January this year Executive Order
13771 which is entitled "Reducing Regulations and
Controlling Regulatory Costs." This is the so-
called two-for-one regulation. Now, don't ask me
what two-for-one means, whether it's two words
for one word, two dollars for one dollar of cost,
that's still being developed.

I'll also mention as a sidebar that
the United States isn't the first one to come out
with that. I understand that the UK has a three-for-one regulatory initiative that they're doing, and Canada has got a similar two-to-one. What they mean, I don't really know yet, but we're not unique in that.

The next one has just come out very recently, on the 24th of February, I just read this one, Executive Order 13777, which is entitled "Enforcing Regulatory Reform Agenda." And the key thing here is that this executive order directs agencies to identify a regulatory reform officer and regulatory reform task forces to talk about how this regulatory reform is going to be done. And OMB has 60 days to get guidance out with respect to how this regulatory reform is going to be done.

With that, they're the most recent things that I think you should be aware of. But I also think that perspective is probably in order also. For example, two other executive orders which we ought to make note of. One is 12866 and that's from the 20th of September 1993
from the Clinton administration, and that talks
about basically that regulations should have net
benefits, we shouldn't have regulations that
impose a cost to society without having a greater
amount of benefits to the extent possible. It
also talks about that if there are several
different ways to achieve something, the one with
the greatest net benefit should be the one
chosen. And again, this is from 1993 and that
has been really under development from the Reagan
years and before.

The other one I would mention is of
the 18th f January 2011, Executive Order 13563,
"Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review" from
the Obama administration. And essentially what
that says is that agencies should take a look at
the regulations they have in place and do a
retrospective analysis to see if the benefits
that were predicted when that regulation went
into place five years ago, ten years ago,
whatever, have actually proven to be effective
and having a net benefit.
The reason I go through all of that is to try to focus you on the things that are out there, but also to say that this regulatory reform, though magnified to a greater extent than in years past, is not something that's new. I've been in the regulatory development staff for about ten years now, and I will tell you that with the Obama administration it got increasingly difficult to get regulations through the system to get published because of the scrutiny on cost and the net benefits.

So with that, again, I just try to bring that to your attention, to let you know this is evolutionary, don't have a whole lot of answers with respect to how regulations will be coming out. But I would also offer to think about alternatives to regulations. I should also mention that regulations also are major policy documents, so it's just as difficult today to get a NVIC out as a regulation. There's a freeze on that also. So think about other alternatives.

I would be remiss if I didn't talk
about standards development, that if you have
something you want to create in an ISO standard,
an ASTM standard, an ANSI standard, this is
something that you may want to consider in the
back of your mind in lieu of regulations. And
that goes back to an Office of Management and
Budgets Memo A119 in the early 1990s.

Long answer to your question but I did
want to give a perspective on where we are with
regulatory development and what the future might
hold.

CDR HILBERT: Great. Thank you very
much. And Mike will be up coming up next under
the new business section, so he might be able to
take questions at that time.

Mr. Salvesen.

MR. SALVESEN: Mine is a little bit
tsimpler question. Is there any kind of update or
status on where we stand with regards to inert
gas on tankers under 20,000 dead weight tons?

CDR HILBERT: Fair enough. For those
that aren't aware, there is a SOLAS amendment
related to inert gas that changed applicability for inert gas systems depending on the dead weight of vessel and really sort of made it applicable to smaller ships and across the suite of what's defined as a taker. That's something that my office in ENG-5, along with Pat, that we're looking at for developing an approach for incorporating that SOLAS requirement and taking a look internally to see how that impacts current Coast Guard regulations in Subchapter D and all the corresponding guidance in the Marine Safety Manual that's out there and how that would impact Coast Guard regulations, NVIC, and then policy in the Marine Safety Manual.

That's something that Pat and I are looking at right now and then coordinating with other offices within headquarters on how to tackle that.

MR. SALVESEN: Do you foresee that as being a regulatory package?

CDR HILBERT: It would really depend on how the Coast Guard approaches. If that's
something where we had to amend or change the
applicability in Subchapter D, then yes, the
regulation would need to be changed. But we
don't have a clear way ahead as far as the Coast
Guard's approach for moving forward with that at
this time.

MR. PRAZAK: Any other questions?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. Next up on
the agenda is Dr. Cyndi Znati. She's here to
give us a quick update on the Chemical Data
Guide.

DR. ZNATI: Good afternoon. I'm the
first one who gets to say that.

As I'm sure most of you are aware, our
Chemical Data Guide, also known as the Blue Book,
was last updated and published in 1990. When CTAC
was restarted in 2012, one of the recommendations
from CTAC was that we should look into updating
the Blue Book to add additional chemicals and
additional information that has been published
for some of the entries in the book. In the past
the update was carried out within our division,
but we don't have the staff levels anymore that
would allow us to put the significant amount of
time into updating the Blue Book by ourselves.
In addition, we don't have the room in our budget
to contract with anybody to do that update.

However, speaking with Larry -- don't
forget to sign his card -- he mentioned that NFPA
had been doing updates based on the updates to
the IBC Code in their databases for fire
protection, and that NFPA would be willing to
provide that information to us for a small sum.
So just before the fiscal year ended last year,
we managed to get the contract all worked out and
we contracted with NFPA to provide us with the
database for the chemicals and the data they had
for the chemicals.

We have received the database from
NFPA, however, the format that NFPA uses is quite
a bit different from the Blue Book, the
traditional format of the Blue Book, and we need
to internally sit down and decide how we're going
to use the database that we now have and then the
best way to publish that information to the
public. My guess is, based on our budget status,
is that we will not have the funds to publish it
as a hard copy the way the book has been
published in the past. I am at this point
imagining that it's going to be some type of
downloadable PDF that people will be able to
download from the Coast Guard.

If anybody has suggestions for how
they would like to see the data, please let us
know, but that's essentially where the project
stands at this point.

MR. PRAZAK: Very good. Any
questions?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you.

So what I'd like to do now, one of the
things that I think is important for all of us in
the industry is to learn from other incidents.
This is called Lessons Learned from a Methanol
Explosion, and the information I pulled directly
from a white paper that was published by the
owners, in conjunction with their flag state and
some other folks, based on their investigation.
I'm not saying I agree with everything in the
report, I'm just telling you what the report
says.

But what I'd like to do is during each
of our meetings if someone has something of
interest like that, drop me a note on that so we
can get those things because it's information
that's interesting to us, it goes back to what
John brought up a moment ago about using nitrogen
and things of that nature, and I think it is
important for all of us to understand those
things.

So kind of giving you a lead up to
this. The vessel was the Bunga Alpinia. This
was in July of 2012. She was a 38,000 dead
weight chemical tanker, she was loading methanol
which has a pretty low flashpoint but inverting
was not required so the tanks were under air.
She had loaded some of the tanks in the Middle
East first and she was now in Southeast Asia

loading the balance of the cargo.

As a result of the incident, five crew
members lost their lives, the vessel was scrapped
because she was a destructive loss -- you'll see
why when you see pictures at the end -- of course
lost damaged cargo and damage to the nearby
facilities. So it was a bit of a mess.

So they were loading the balance of
the tanks, their plan was to load one wing, so
one port and starboard, two wings, five wings,
six wings and nine wings. They had done tank
inspections, they had done wall washes, all those
things had passed, and then they commenced
loading into one port, two port and starboard,
six port and starboard. They were not using
vapor control so no vapors were coming back to
shore for treatment. All the vapors coming off
the tanks as they were loading were going through
the PV valves and venting out.

About six hours into transfer, there
was a sudden squall storm that hit the vessel.
There were lightning strikes and the lightning strikes struck the PV tower, ignited the vapor, and then it actually went backwards through the -- what they think happened based on their investigation was that it actually flowed back through the safety valve into the cargo tank which led to the initial explosion, and then that initial explosion led to subsequent additional explosions.

Here toward the end I want to turn a little bit over to one of our members because their company actually assisted in the transshipment of the balance of the cargo that was not destroyed, so I'm going to turn it over to Jim here in a few minutes just to briefly talk about their experience in dealing with the incident too.

I have a little bit of video here, I don't know if you'll hear the sound.

(Video was shown.)

MR. PRAZAK: Part of the thing they looked at was the PV valves. The PV valves were
certified to national and international standards, they were approved for use by several classification societies. They pulled some of those safety valves that were as spares on some of their other vessels in their fleet and tested those. All of them failed the flashback and flow tests which comes out of ISO 15634, every one of them failed to stop the flashback.

So the results from the owners' perspective was that -- and this is looking at what ended up happening -- all the tanks that were partially loaded with methanol suffered from the explosion so it was the cargo tanks that were being loaded currently that had the air in them. The tanks that were fully loaded with the same grade of cargo at the previous port didn't explode.

The lightning only struck the PV valves in the region of one wing and two wings, so it was that one cluster of PV valves that started it, and then it cascaded. All the cargo tanks onboard the vessel were fitted with the
identical PV valves from the same manufacturer,
and then the explosion in one wings and two
wings are what caused the subsequent explosions
in the other tanks. So a big mess.

Points of issue, this is coming from
the owners' perspective. Unlike oil product and
gas carriers, chemical carriers do not normally
require inerting for flammable. Their feeling is
that it's because tank inspection are required
and no one wants inerted tanks where they do go
do inspections, and so the chemical industry in a
lot of cases doesn't inert, and that's what their
opinion is. I don't necessarily agree with that
because I inert a lot of tanks that I load after
inspection, and I know other companies do as
well.

MR. PONTIKOS: Another comment is the
regulations are changing or they have already
changed.

MR. PRAZAK: It's catching up, and
this was several years ago. I agree.

A lot of chemical cargoes only allow
nitrogen for inerting, you can't use inert gas, flue gas and things of that nature, because it's not clean enough for our cargoes and it could damage the cargo. And then you take polymerizing cargoes, cargoes like styrene, they polymerize and the inhibitor that's used to prevent polymerization requires oxygen for the inhibitor to do its job, and so if you inert too far, you can actually have an opposite issue which you cause the cargo to polymerize and it can be from a quality issue to a catastrophic issue, depending on how far you let it get. So if you're going to do inerting of those kind of cargoes, you've got to find that sweet spot before you have other problems.

Some other points that the owners talked about was tank coatings have gotten better, there are some better tank coatings out there than there were 15-20-25 years ago, so tanks are easier to clean. And there's better tank design. When chemical tankers first started, there were modified product barriers,
you had structure all inside of them that were
hard to clean. Now people have learned that the
less structure you put in the tanks, the easier
it is to get that tank clean, the more flat
surfaces and vertical surfaces, the easier it is.
So owners have gone a long ways. What they're
kind of suggesting and looking toward is maybe we
don't need to do tank inspections from a faulty
standpoint.

The owners are doing more risk
assessments. They've actually put lightning
detectors on their vessels. One of the things --
again, I didn't really agree with this -- they
said only the terminal can suspend operations
when there's nearby storms or lightning, and I
don't think that's the case, I don't agree with
that, but that's what the owners' comment was.
They said that if the shore is pumping to a ship,
we can't block our valve until the terminal
stops. So if we say, hey, there's a lightning
storm and we need to stop transfer, if the
terminal doesn't shut the pump down, then they
can't close their valve and stop the flow.
Again, I don't necessarily agree with that. I
don't think any facility, at least here in the
U.S., would keep pumping when the ship says, hey,
I need you to stop. That violates every tenet we
have in the industry.

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: Well, it makes
sense in a way. We're going through the energy
facility design now and the way the ESD systems
they're going to work, first the terminal supply
has to stop the flow and then the sitting vessel
as a secondary. So first the terminal is going
to stop the flow in case they have an issue on
the terminal side, and then the vessel is going
to follow on the ESD affirmation.

MR. PRAZAK: For LNG that's typical
but most facilities don't have that on the
chemical side, they don't exist, we don't the ESD
type linkage or anything like that. But still, I
can't imagine any facility refusing to stop
transfer when a ship requests to stop transfer.
I didn't totally agree with that.
The other thing they're doing is selecting new PV valves that have a higher standard of testing and things of that nature. They had other ideas that I referred to earlier, reducing tank inspections and wall washes. They want to eliminate wall washes or accept the results of the wall washes done by the crew members. And then inert prior to loading those low flash cargoes with the adaptation for the inhibited cargoes that need some oxygen. They suggested some industry changes like terminals provide nitrogen, again better testing for the safety valves, looking at lightning strikes, and avoid delays waiting for first foot results. Their idea was by letting that tank sit for first feet -- I guess I should explain that for folks who don't understand. First foot means you'd put about a foot of cargo, three foot, depends on the company, and you stop the transfer, you pull samples. The idea there is primarily to look at what may have been in the pipeline. The surveyor can't see in the pipeline
on the ship and so the idea is that if there was
something hidden in the pipeline that the
surveyor missed that he couldn't see, then you
catch it in the first foot, so instead of having
a full tank full of contaminated cargo, you only
had that first foot, it's much less cargo.

But one of the things they were
pointing out was if you partially load that tank
and then let it sit, if it's a hot day and
everything like that, now you're starting to
evaporate that product and you're putting
yourself in that spot to where you're --
typically I think the idea is during a typical
load you go from being not enough product in the
vapors to have a fire to passing through the
flammable zone up to the point that you have so
much vapor that it can't be matted, you don't
have enough oxygen there. And the idea is to
minimize that time because you might hit that
sweet spot for a much longer time than if you let
that cargo sit there for five-six-seven hours
doing testing. So that was one of their other
ideas.

So again, their conclusions, since vessels don't have nitrogen, they think the terminals must be required to provide it. And again, the rules are changing right now, that's correct. Concern about vessels in similar conditions being attacked with explosives which then could set off, if a tank happened to be in that flammable zone during that time, could that lead to a further explosion. They raised some concerns had that cargo been more toxic versus what it was, the methanol which is fairly volatile and things.

Anyway, I thought it was an interesting perspective and I want to turn briefly to Jim just to kind of tell their experience. I guess you took the balance of cargo that was still on the vessel.

MR. MONIGAN: Jim Monigan, Ardmore Shipping. My previous company was Fairfield Chemical Carriers.

I don't have much to add to your
presentation, I think you pretty thoroughly covered the take-aways from this catastrophe, but I do have some slides and photos of the damage to the ship. We obviously did this after all the insurance companies had their dirty hands in it, but the damage was pretty extensive. So that's all I had to show. Other than that, it was a pretty basic SDS operation.

MR. PRAZAK: With the ship leaning and half burned and everything else.

MR. MONIGAN: And the deck just peeled open like a sardine can and the pipelines looking like spaghetti.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Pretty basic SDS. So that's how you guys work?

(General laughter.)

MR. PRAZAK: Was there any methanol left? Did they put the fire out for the tanks that were peeled open with methanol in them?

MR. MONIGAN: Yes.

MR. PRAZAK: Was there still methanol in those tanks?
MR. MONIGAN: Yes.

MR. PRAZAK: Was it foamed or was it just water?

MR. MONIGAN: It was foamed and then there was also they had constant CO2 on it so it was heavier to keep the vapors from coming out, so it was pretty interesting.

MR. PRAZAK: Y'all took that cargo too?

MR. MONIGAN: Yeah, we took it all.

MR. PONTIKOS: The receiving vessel was inerted?

MR. MONIGAN: Yes. We were inerted completely, we were completely inerted before.

MR. PRAZAK: You weren't going to have deja vu at that point.

MR. MONIGAN: That was our policy to begin with. I mean, that goes to the whole safety standards and Guy Johnson's talk -- I don't know if everybody is aware of Guy Johnson and his approach to wall washes and so on so that ships can arrive inerted and can load without
having a wall wash inspection. It's interesting stuff if you ever look into it.

MR. PRAZAK: Very good. Any other questions?

MR. BOUDREAUX: How did you transfer?

MR. MONIGAN: Submersible pumps.

MR. BOUDREAUX: They had hydraulic power?

MR. MONIGAN: We supplied it. There were some generators there as well.

MR. PRAZAK: I'll call on Ashley.

MS. CASTLE-CARPENTER: So they said that the things that had been loaded at the other places didn't explode. Is that because they weren't in the explosive range? Did they support that in there?

MR. PRAZAK: They didn't get into that detail, they just made the point that those tanks that were already loaded. So I guess what you could conceive was either the safety valves weren't open, so even if the lightning had struck in that area, maybe there was no chance -- with
the valve not open, the lightning probably
couldn't back through it. Or the fact that it
was beyond.

MR. JONES: I have a comment. I
mentioned earlier I work for Inardo. We make
flame and detonation arresters, and I've sat
committees, like the ISO committee, where we
developed the flame arrester standards and the
like. We've had some experience with this type
of thing, unfortunately.

And the issue that we found with
methanol, one of the issues, is that around 80
degrees Fahrenheit that stuff's stoichiometric at
atmospheric conditions. It's not like gasoline
or hydrocarbon where you have high vapor
pressures that you're above the UEL. This stuff
is in a sweet spot under ambient conditions,
typically like you might find in some of these
locations; you know, mid 80s, upper 70s, you're
going to find that stuff is going to be in the
explosive range.

And another comment, I see the PV
valves, I think a lot of us are probably familiar with the PV valves, but the PV valves that are typically used in these applications are not the kind that we see in shore locations, in tank batteries and the like. These are probably what's called high velocity event valves. They're not the PV valves that we typically would think of if we're thinking about something that's on a land-based system.

There is, in fact, a very comprehensive testing protocol that's been out there since 2008 for the high velocity vents because they're actually considered as a type of flame arrester. Our company doesn't make them, they're made by various companies, but they're very specialized and they go under very different testing criteria than you might find for a common PV vent that would be used in a tank farm. But there's a lot goes with that.

And then, of course, there are arrester products that would have prevented that propagation. The unfortunate part of lightning
strikes typically would cause a flammable stream
like that to transition immediately to
detonation. It wouldn't go through the normal
propagation stages, it would be instantaneous
detonation that would propagate the system. So
it was a pretty thorny deal.

MR. PRAZAK: Any questions?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: We have maybe 15 more
minutes to go. Are we okay going on?

Next on the agenda is new business and
subcommittee recommendations.

The Coast Guard has approached us to
consider a new subcommittee effort, and what I'd
like to do is call Mike Blair to come up and kind
of tell us from his perspective what they're
asking us to look at. We have drafted a task
statement that we'll briefly go through and then
we'll discuss the idea about it and go from
there.
MR. BLAIR: Thanks, James.

It may be worthwhile to put up the
task statement at this point. I'm going to
briefly go through the task statement. I'll
mention that we have about 60 regulations in our
portfolio at headquarters that span a whole a
range of marine safety, security and
environmental protection, and this HAZSUB
twins -- which I appreciate the fact that it's
actually defined on the back of your agenda
here -- is the oldest regulatory development
project that we have in our portfolio, so I
appreciate the CTAC helping us out on this.

I'll briefly go through this. My
compadre, Glen Mine, sort of kicked this off and
teed this up at headquarters at your last
meeting, and what essentially this is is from OPA
90, for the oil part of OPA 90, regulations came
out fairly quickly in the early 90s and talked
about the planning for worst case scenario
discharges and all the things that are
incorporated with respect to that planning
For hazardous substances, an NPRM came out in the late 90s, in 1999 and recognizing that hazardous substances are maybe more complex than oil, maybe more diverse than oil with respect to its properties and responses and things along those lines, that's why it didn't come out in final rule with the oil, but we did publish a NPRM and notice of proposed rulemaking in 1999 but then 9/11 came along and our focus shifted just a little bit.

We did reopen the comment period in 2011 when we did get some comments back on that, but the fact of the matter is, and going back to what I was talking about that our regulations have to be cost beneficial, the fact that the chemical transportation industry has been so safe over the years, we have not been able to come up with a scenario that meets the specific direction of OPA 90 that is cost beneficial. And we're not talking like we're off like 1.1 to 1 cost benefit, we're talking a fairly significant cost
to the benefits based on the casualties that
we've got in our system.

So congratulations to the industry for
being safe, but from what CAPT Martin had said
with the risks that are here, the consequences,
the danger and also notice the MTBE spill that he
had mentioned, that there are risks here. So
what we're looking here for is despite the good
efforts and the great safety record is assistance
from CTAC.

And if we go to page 2 of the task
statement, I want to briefly go through the
different tasks that are stated here. One is to
review the existing congressional mandate under
OPA 90, and it's kind of for the worst case
scenario, including qualified individual, HAZROs,
equipment, training, drills, all those sorts of
things, and to look at this from a facility point
of view, a vessel point of view, domestic
vessels, inland barges, for example, and vessels
that engage in foreign transits.

And there's a few things that have
happened since OPA 90. One of them is the SMPEP, the Shipboard Marine Pollution Emergency Response Plan, that has come out of IMO. But the things that we're talking about here for OPA are non-mandatory requirements in the SMPEP, but that would not apply to ships on foreign voyages, whether U.S. or foreign flagged.

So the second part is what other existing regulations are there that have driven the good compliance of the industry, what are the other federal, state and local things that are driving compliance, what are the other drivers that aren't regulatory in nature, insurance, litigation, contractual issues, responsible care programs, things like that. What are these things, what is the patchwork that exists that we don't have to duplicate this in a rulemaking, in the event that we do a rulemaking. Other existing response plans that you're required to have by other drivers. Are there things that you do routinely from these other drivers for drills and exercises. And then to provide us with an
edification, if you will, that tells us what
you're doing and what you recommend moving
forward.

I talked about the difficulty of
getting regulations done now and in the future,
and again, I don't know exactly how this is going
to play out, but I would again recommend in your
recommendations that you include, perhaps, a
consideration of developing standards that are
either international or domestic -- if we're
looking at domestic barges, for example -- that
may be of benefit in lieu of regulations. And
this standard doesn't have to be one huge
standard that talks about all these things, maybe
ey they could be smaller standards, I don't know,
but if you would include that as part of your
recommendations, I think that would be
worthwhile.

I think I want to hold it there and
maybe ask for questions or comments, or Mr.
Prazak, if you want to add to this.

MR. PRAZAK: I guess from my
perspective, not as chairman but as a member of the committee and of industry, we've been involved with OPA 90 as far as CTAC from the get-go, I guess it was, and hazardous substances. CTAC has always been engaged because we're the committee that probably has the biggest impact and concern about that. Again, from an industry perspective, one of my biggest fears is if there is a major incident that garnishes a lot of publicity and congressional attention, the fact that these are not out might be recognized and there may be rather than a congressional push that already exists to have these out, it might not become a push, it may become a mandate, and that mandate may drive some requirements that are more of a knee-jerk reaction than a necessary reaction. And so I don't like knee-jerk reactions because they tend to hurt industry a whole lot more than they really need to.

So from my perspective, I look at it and say if the Coast Guard is approaching us for this kind of help, this is good for the industry,
it's good to be out ahead of it, it's good to try
to go ahead and address it, and again, a lot of
the focus is on what do we already do today,
what's already out there that can be leveraged
that we do that probably already meets the intent
of these regulations or the congressional
expectations. So that's my perspective on the
situation.

And I guess what I'd like to do before
we make a motion and go any further is kind of go
back out to the committee and to the public for
input on their thoughts.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Quick comment. The
reason I got involved in CTAC in 2000 was HAZSUB
regs, period, and that's what drove it. It was
painful, all the discussions that went on, the
mandates that were going to be required in terms
of response times, people on the ground, et
cetera.

Obviously, to your point, Mr. Blair,
industry has done a good job. So I can't
encourage people enough. I think this is
something we definitely need to take on and really hammer down on the fact that there are certain procedures and processes already in play and we really need to lock onto what those are. And it would make it a whole lot easier than the pain we went through until 9/11 occurred and then completely diverted our attention. So I totally encourage this.

MR. PRAZAK: Paul Lambert.

MR. LAMBERT: One of the changes, I think, over time, at the beginning it was mandated that all resources had to be by the plan holder and you couldn't incorporate government type or non plan holder resources into your plan. In today's world there's some areas where they're allowing the benefit of partnering with cities and states and adding that into their plan, and so that's an area of issue with OPA 90.

MR. PRAZAK: Margaret.

MS. DOYLE: I don't know if you're aware, a report was done on this in 1996. I know because I chaired it.
(General talking and laughter.)

MS. DOYLE: I guess the point is one of the things we really ran into was the resources they were going to call out based on the law of OPA, and the thing that really scared the heck out of was the worst case scenarios. That's loss of the entire vessel and you have a lot of different cargoes, we just didn't even know how to -- it was such a pause at that point to deal with that.

And the other issue was the Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act did not reflect the IVC Code, so you could come in and you could have a spill and it would say it's not covered under the Clean Water Act. So there's things in OPA 90 that need to change in order for us to be more effective. And I think we can dig it up, Parmi might have it, I don't know if I have it. There was definitely some issues that we thought we can't go any further because of the requirements of the actual OPA, the law itself.

MR. BLAIR: I would encourage the
committee working on this to be creative, and I agree that meeting the word as written in OPA 90 is challenging. And I'm not saying I can change what the legislative mandate is, but the intent, the result, the things that are being done, I think identifying those and providing those in your recommendations are an important way to go to achieve what we want to achieve, especially recognizing that meeting the letter of OPA 90 is not cost-effective at this point.

MS. DOYLE: No. And the other is that do you have this conversation and have this group, do you have MSRC and NRC in the room? -- because they'll come out and say for certain ports they don't have the resources. I mean, John, that's why you were involved.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Right. I mean, the coverages simply weren't there, we weren't going to meet the mandates.

MR. PRAZAK: Parmi.

MR. SANDHU: This is Parmi Sandhu with American Petroleum.
All the things that have been said by John and the rest of the folks here, Paul and of course Margaret, and also James, they all make sense. I had the pleasure of three subcommittees, chairing three subcommittees during that time. Some of those recommendations were made to NFPA which started a chapter within the NFPA to address training requirements, et cetera. And the complexity of this whole issue was -- as you mentioned in your opening remarks, is the diversity of the different types of things and so many different types, vapors and liquid gases and all those types of things that go on.

So what the folks at the time, the committees came up with is the best way to prepare for it is not just a whole slew of equipment that is staged over, because it may not be applicable, but you have to have training so people understand how to secure the safety of the population, the port, the infrastructure, air monitoring, people responding to these things, et cetera.
So a lot of work has been done I think that can be pulled out, NFPA has it, the Coast Guard should have it too, I certainly have some of those things that I'd be happy to provide them back. But as Margaret was saying, worst-case scenarios for oil is something you can corral around and so forth; in the chemical world it's very difficult to do that, so the response is completely different.

And therefore, the requirements are not just based on how much boom you're going to stage here, et cetera; it's more about -- at least at the time, a great amount of it was towards the training and the specialization and the air monitoring and safety kind of things that you would require to sort of manage the while event.

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you.

MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: So the complexity of the chemicals and whatever I have experienced lately, the weakness of the ports,
the kind of casualties on LPG and LPG carriers,
so that is something that is not -- I mean, as an
LNG sea operator I'm obliged when I enter the
port to have my certificate of financial
responsibility, my QI to be on standby, but then
in case something happens, how quickly the
infrastructure of the port is going to be able to
respond to a casualty? And that I think is
something that we'll realize in the process that
is missing also, and I don't know how the LPG or
LNG in particular transport can fit into that --
I mean, along with the chemical hazardous
materials, how the LNG can fit into that.

      MS. DOYLE: Well, it doesn't fall
under OPA 90. Margaret Doyle.

      MR. DIMITROPOULOUS: It doesn't fall,
but we use OPA 90 when we have a vessel exposed
to that. Thank God we have not had a case like
that, but if it happens, I mean, there is no
responder, there is no infrastructure, there is
no salvage.

      MS. DOYLE: That's a whole other ball
of wax.

MR. BLAIR: I think a good point to make also is under OPA 90 that has hazardous substance plans required, hazardous substances are just a handful of hazardous substances under the Clean Water Act, but how about the other noxious substances, the NLSs, how about the other sorts of things that can be considered hazardous materials?

OPA 90 has 80-some hazardous substances, but maybe as part of the recommendations you bring up LPG, LNG, some of the other things that you may think may be worthy of consideration. Defining what these hazardous substances are which may be beyond the 80-some substances would certainly be interested as part of the recommendation.

MR. PRAZAK: Norman.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I'm Norman O'Shaughnessy from Stolt Tankers USA.

I'm sorry, but I fail to see how what you're asking is any different than the SMPEP
that's already in place, which covered noxious liquid substances.

    MR. PRAZAK: But they don't cover every vessel, barges don't have them.

    MR. BLAIR: They cover vessels on foreign excursions, but the SMPEP don't require a qualified individual, they don't require HAZROs, they don't specify training or equipment, they're non-mandatory sections of the SMPEP which I'm not sure how many of these ships have it but they would not apply to domestic barges, unless you guys are doing it voluntarily, I don't know, and it certainly would not apply to facilities. So I think SMPEP is a movement in the right direction but it doesn't cover all the things that OPA 90 would require.

    MR. PRAZAK: So the idea of the group is to identify what's in the SMPEP that's in alignment, where are the gaps, and then we have to look at what the barges are doing, we have to look at what the U.S. flagged vessels are doing. That would be what the group would be looking at.
MR. KEFFLER: Pat Keffler, Coast Guard, ENG-5.

I'd recommend, James, if you could scroll down the draft task statement so that we can see the tasks, just till you get to the tasks 1 through 6 that we came up with.

I would think that what we're proposing to the advisory committee is not to try to rehash seven or eight years of work that was done ten years ago or completed ten years ago. We have that work. I think that there would probably be a brief period of time validate perhaps the work that was done and maybe call out any other issues when going through that validation. But I think this is a process where we're looking for assistance from industry because we believe industry probably already meets the vast intent of what Congress was asking us to impose. And we're hoping to do this without it being another massive regulatory project, at least that's kind of what the
conceptual view was -- and help me if I'm going off the rails here -- but we're not looking to undertake another ten-year of all these lists. I have all of that information.

Like I said, let's briefly validate the product that was delivered before, and then what we're really doing is looking at these five or six questions here about are these items that industry is already accomplishing, can we capture it in this reg project so that we don't fall through and break every economic requirement that we need to meet in putting together a 21st Century regulatory project. Because that's ultimately what happened is the request from Congress came out in 1990, by the time we put the rule up our own chain, it couldn't meet the economic analysis and it failed. Most of the work was already done. We just need to maybe look at it and capture it a different way.

MR. PRAZAK: And I guess to add, based on what he was saying as far as what Mike said as far as being creative and looking at a little
different perspective, not knowing where this
would go if we did it and what we'd come up with,
but one of the options the Coast Guard has is to
be able to go to Congress and say this is what
the industry already has in place, these are
meeting the intent, these are some places where
they can't really meet the intent but there's no
added value from a cost perspective to meeting
that intent, so maybe Congress needs to tweak the
law to take those requirements out. I'm not
trying to put words in their mouth, but I think
that's where he's saying be creative is we have
to see where this thing would lead, but that's a
possibility, I guess.

Margaret.

MS. DOYLE: And I think that's a great
idea. But one fear I have is as we proceed is
that we do not promote any sort of cottage
industry for HAZSUB response. That's the thing
that scares the heck out of me. People say I can
do this, I can do that.

MR. TEMPERILLI: And I'll add onto
that. John Temperilli with CTH.

There's a lot that has changed,
there's a lot changing in ancillary
transportation modes, so there's a protector,
there's a blanket out there that's come into
existence since we first tackled this.

To your point, we don't have to create
those cottage industries. I think there's a lot
of things already in play, particular as regards
in one case the railroads where they've met and
they have moved ahead in the last 10 to 15 years
in terms of how we respond inland and how we
respond in areas that were completely vacated.
So I think we have answers but we're going to
have to ferret them out.

So I agree with you, we don't want to
do that, from my perspective we really don't want
to go back to that whole heavy lift that you're
talking about.

MR. KEFFLER: Pat Keffler again.

That part of the discussion is kind of
putting the cart before the horse. I think this
group would probably not come up with advice that
led in that direction. So we'd go about trying
to answer the homework questions that we've teed
up in the task statement.

MR. TEMPERILLI: I think part of the
consideration there is from my perspective it
would be to recommend, much as we're doing with
security, we're going to look at the tangential
transportation modes for information it can
provide. Because I think there's some economies
of scale that have been achieved and we can
leverage that. I think part of the answer exists
in the industries that we respond today, we've
just got to figure out what those are and ratchet
them down into this task statement.

MR. PRAZAK: Any other questions? Any
from the right side, back side, over here?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. So I think
the request from the Coast Guard and I guess the
proposal on the table is that CTAC stand up a
subcommittee on hazardous substance response
plans for tank vessels and facilities. Do we have a motion?

MR. TEMPERILLI: So moved.

MR. PRAZAK: John T for the first. Do we have a second?

MR. NUNEZ: Second.

MR. PRAZAK: I hear Lance back there for a second. Any discussion, questions?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All in favor of standing up the subcommittee as per the proposal, please raise your hand and say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. PRAZAK: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. We passed.

Thank you very much. You have a subcommittee.

MR. BLAIR: Well, thank you very much. I'm really looking forwards to this and I think it's a great opportunity, and thank you, CTAC, for what you're going to develop.

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you, sir.
All right. We're getting toward the end. You're getting quieter, I think.

Another thing I'd like to slip in here on some new business is a real quick discussion or just to see if you have any questions or comments, and that is right now we have LNG working, we now have a new subcommittee on response plans, we have John's effort as well, and then we have the vapor control systems working, so we have four groups that are working right now. Are there any particular pressing issues from the industry or Coast Guard perspective that people feel that we ought to be addressing but we're not?

Looking at things now with four subcommittees going, I think that's a good number, I think with three we have more bandwidth, but I think with four, Margaret's group is going -- how long do you think your group is going to keep going, if you had to throw a number out?

MS. DOYLE: I would say two more
years. There's a couple of other things we haven't even touched.

MR. PRAZAK: So that one is a long term. This one we're looking at probably 18 months is what we kind of targeted, I believe, April of 2018, so about 18 months. Anyway, we're looking at about 18 months to two years.

John, yours is going to go for a little while yet, security a little while. And VCS?

MR. YOUNG: Six months maybe.

MR. PRAZAK: Six months, maybe a year. So unless something really pressing pops up on the radar, I think we'll plan to kind of run, I think four is a good number for us. It partly depends on how intensive the effort is as well, but I think right now four. If someone does have something that's coming up that becomes a big issue for you, drop us a note so we can start looking at it and trying to see how we want to address that issue and things like that.

Next meeting date and location. The
next meeting location is planned for D.C., for Washington at headquarters. Typically we're meeting twice a year; that would put us meeting August or so, August-September. That's a really bad time for those of us who live down here on the Gulf Coast, we're kind of battening down the hatches and waiting for hurricanes. So rather than book it during that time, plus there's some other meetings going on, what we'd like to do is look at early October.

Does anyone know of any conflicts with conferences, IMO, whatever the case may be, either the 3rd, 4th and 5th of October, that first week of October, or the second week or the third week?

CAPT IBSEN: Third week of October is ESPH.

MR. PRAZAK: So we scratch that week for sure.

How about this, let's tentatively look at either -- I would lean to the 3rd through the 5th. I think that would be better because I
think the ESPH is that folks may need to be in
the office doing their final prep before they go
to ESPH that 10th through the 13th. So look at
your calendars for the 3rd through the 5th, drop
me a note if you have any conflicts. If I don't
hear anything in the next week or so, we'll look
at space to make sure we can get a conference
rooms for all the subcommittees and book it for
there.

Subcommittees. Let me kind of start
with Margaret, do you have any dates planned for
your next group?

    MS. DOYLE: Yeah. We have April,
we're going to finalize that at the next meeting
in April, and we'll probably have another before
October, but right now the only one I have
tentative, and as soon as I get those over to
you.

    MR. PRAZAK: Is that Houston?

    MS. DOYLE: No. It's going to be that
collocated meeting.

    MR. PRAZAK: Okay. That's right.
LNG. John, do you have any dates already preplanned?

MR. TEMPERILLI: No, not preplanned, but April we're going to float three dates and see what comes up, and it will probably be here with a conference call. I don't anticipate having a venue or a meeting in D.C.

MR. PRAZAK: VCS?

MR. YOUNG: Nothing yet.

MR. PRAZAK: All right. It might be easier if when you have those, let us know.

If you are a member of the public or member of the committee and you are interested in participating in any of these efforts, drop a note to the subcommittee chair. If you don't know how to get ahold of them, drop me a note. If you are interested in being involved in the new subcommittee for the OPA 90 stuff, drop me a note, and the once we finalize the chairman of the subcommittee effort, we will get you plugged in with that person.

All right. One last time, let me go
first to the committee members, let me kind of run around and see if anyone has anything else to add.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Got one. You need to update your terms list to include first foot and SMPEP.

LCDR BLANCHFIELD: I'd never heard of that acronym so it wasn't on the list.

MR. TEMPERILLI: I know, I understand.

MR. PRAZAK: Norman, can you help her, can you send her SMPEP, can you send her what that means, please?

Let me keep going around here.

Anything?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Going to the public on the right side, anything from the public that anyone would like to make any comments or anything? Back row? This side, anything?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: Wrap up. First thing I'd like to do is thank everyone who helped make this
meeting a success. First thing is the folks that came out to dinner and helped support dinner last night. I know Ron Corigliaio provided donuts one of the days here and our company provided donuts and coffee. So all those people that helped us meet, appreciate that.

New members, raise your hands again.
Welcome. Thank you for serving, thank you for joining us. So thank you very much.

Outgoing members, raise your hands.
Guys, thank you so much for your service. Thank y'all very much.

(Applause.)

MR. PRAZAK: Don't be strangers. Just because you're not on the committee doesn't mean you stop coming to meetings.

MS. DOYLE: Eugene Bradley, who has been a real plus to Moran Towing, he's a great guy, he's been great with the LNG Subcommittee, he's very quiet, he's very unassuming, he's a big Orioles fan, but Molly Moran was here yesterday, he had a kidney transplant last week and didn't
tell anyone. So I just texted him and said we're thinking of you, so I just wanted to give you heads-up there.

MR. PRAZAK: Very good.

Let's see. The Federal Register notice did come out for new members. If you are interested in applying to become a member of CTAC, go to that Federal Register notice. Is it on Homeport?

LCDR BLANCHFIELD: Yes. On our Homeport page you can see the process for submitting and information if you want to fill one of those vacancies, so it may be a little bit easier to read than an entire Federal Register notice, but it's on Homeport.

CDR HILBERT: Or if you know anyone else in the maritime industry that you think would add value to especially that new subcommittee that's coming up, because as James said, with four subcommittees we could start getting strapped, especially with the complexity of the Security Subcommittee and the LNG. So
we're looking for new talent, if you will, and interested people that might want to be part as a formal committee member, and also not just that, but certainly you don't have to be a committee member to be part of the subcommittee, but we do need someone if they're going to actually be the chair for the subcommittee, need to be a committee member.

MR. TEMPERILLI: Of course, another point there, if I could. John Temperilli with CTH. Just another thanks, Captain, and I know you'll let her know, Paige Dillings was part and parcel of the first two days meetings for the Security Subcommittee and she is absolutely aces. I know she's a the Central Texas Coastal Area Committee this morning, but we want to encourage any of our agency partners, we appreciate that input.

MR. PRAZAK: And it may be something for the HAZSUB work to pull those of those folks in. Okay, very good.

Another round of thanks to Coast Guard
Sector Houston-Galveston. They provide these resources for us and take care of us, and I know we're a pain in the butt because we have a lot of stuff that we have to get through and names and gate lists and all that kind of stuff which is a big hassle, but they come through. They changed a bulb for us which was awesome, so you could actually read what's behind me, and things like that. So we really appreciate all the effort they put in.

So CAPT Martin, special thanks to you for attending today and giving us the presentation. We really, really appreciate it. CDR Carrero, also for your attendance and participation with us as well. It's the support of the Coast Guard, again, makes our industry much better than it would be otherwise, so we really appreciate you being here.

Also, thanks to CDR Hilbert, Captain Select Hilbert for his first and last meeting as our DFO. I guess we burned him up fast.

MR. KEFFLER: It was a bucket list
item for him.

(General laughter.)

MR. PRAZAK: For the short time you've been here, we really, really appreciate it. You've been really active with us, you've stayed really engaged, and we definitely appreciate that. That leadership helps us a lot as a committee.

We also have all the other folks, we have Pat, we have Bob somewhere back there.

MR. TEMPERILLI: No, Bob is gone.

MR. PRAZAK: Oh, he's left. Anyway, he was here earlier. Bob Riemann here helping us on the security side. We've got Cyndi, and of course, we have CDR Blanchfield, Julie. She is the workhorse of this group as far as getting us organized and taking all you RSVPs and getting that onto a list and all that stuff and getting all this stuff organized for us. Again, there's a lot to it that it takes to put these meetings on, and I think it's easier than doing it at headquarters over here, but it is a challenge, so
we really, really appreciate all you do for us. And Cyndi, as well, for being here and taking care of us and everything like that.

   Same thing, thanks to the subcommittee participants, everyone who came and at attended subcommittee meetings. And special thanks to our subcommittee chairs for all the work they put into all this. And then also to all the members of CTAC, thank you all for being here this week and participating and everything else.

   Don't forget, please, if you get a chance before you bug out to sign the card for Larry Russell. I want to kind of make a nice special thing for him, so make sure if you can to catch that before you leave.

   Anything else before we adjourn?

Commander, anything from your side?

   CDR HILBERT: Nothing further, just thank you and I appreciate your patience, especially the last four years, the DFO churn with the Coast Guard, and I know that makes things just a little more challenging for the
committee. Hopefully my successor will be here for three to four years and should add some stability in this chair and build a solid good relationship with him. Just thanks for what I've learned in the last about eight months, and appreciate your time. And really enjoyed working with you, James. Thank you.

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you very much.

Captain, thank you again. Anything you'd like to say before we bug out?

CAPT MARTIN: I just want to thank everyone for your contributions. As I mentioned at the outset, you know, we feds don't always get this right, we absolutely need your help to avoid unintended consequences with regulations, so thank you.

MR. PRAZAK: Thank you, Captain.

(Discussion about leaving Coast Guard property.)

MR. PRAZAK: With that, any other questions, comments?

(No response.)
MR. PRAZAK: Thank you all for pushing and prodding. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Pat Unger has been back there raising his hand, he's first.

So do we have a second? Ashley, I saw her raising her hand so I was going to look at here. Ashley seconds.

All in favor of adjourning say yes.

(A chorus of ayes.)

MR. PRAZAK: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. PRAZAK: All right. We are adjourned. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, at 12:59 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)
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