STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING BOARD OF MARINE PILOTS

MINUTES OF MEETING

October 30, 2013 Anchorage, Alaska

By the authority of AS 08.01.070(2), AS 08.62.030, and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, a meeting of the Alaska Board of Marine Pilots was held on October 30, 2013, in Anchorage, Alaska.

Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 0910 by Chairman Curtis Thayer. The Marine Pilot Coordinator (MPC) conducted roll call.

Participant Members constituting a quorum were:

Hans Antonsen

- Pilot Member

David Arzt

- Pilot Member

Richard Erickson

- Agent Member

Robert Richmond

- Public Member

Tom Rueter

- Agent Member

Tylan Schrock

- Public Member

Curtis Thayer, Chair

- Commissioner's Designee

Staff present:

Crystal Dooley

Marine Pilot Coordinator (MPC)

Sara Chambers

Admin Operations Manager I

Harriet Milks

AAG (joined during Executive Session)

Members of the public present:

Ed Sinclair
Paul Merrill
Doug Sturm
Jenni Zielinski
Eric Eliassen
Ron Ward
Andrew Wakefield
Southeast Alaska Pilot Association
Southeast Alaska Pilot Association
Southwest Alaska Pilot Association

Ron Hildebrand

Trident Seafoods

Mike Tibbles
Jim Lee

Alaska Steamship Association Alaska Maritime Agencies

Luke Hasenbank

Alaska Maritime Agencies Alaska Marine Pilots

Clay Christie

Alaska Marme Lin

Jay Paff

Investigations

Jim Wright

Alaska's Institute of Technology (AVTEC)

There were no public subscribers to the teleconference.

Agenda Item 1 Review and Set Agenda

Hearing no objections to the set agenda, it was:

RESOLVED to approve the agenda.

Declarations of Potential Conflicts of Interest/Recusals

Board members made no declarations of potential conflicts of interest.

Agenda Item 2 Review/Approve Minutes

On review of the April 24, 2013 meeting minutes, there were no objections to the content or convey of Board minutes except to correct a misspelling

Agenda Item 3 Public Comment for 12 AAC 56 115 (c)

The Chair opened the floor to general public comment concerning 12 AAC 56 115(c). There was no comment from the public. The Chair said that in the April meeting there was a proposal by the Foreign Yacht Committee to change regulations. The Chair read the proposed modified regulations for 12 AAC 56 115 (c) as:

"On vessels over 100 feet in length, the captain or master aboard a pleasure craft seeking a pilotage exemption must hold a current mariner's license for the vessel's tonnage. A copy of the mariner's license must be submitted with the application submitted under this section. On a pleasure craft greater than 200 gross tons, the master must hold a valid unlimited radar observer endorsement.

The Chair stated that the change to this regulation was increasing the length from vessels over 65 feet to over 100 feet; an increase of 35 feet. These regulations were discussed by the Board, passed unanimously by the Board, and put out for public comment. The Chair stated that there was no public comment received and

it was noticed that public comment would be taken at that meeting. Since there was no public comment, the Chair entertained a motion to move the regulation to the Lt. Governor's office:

Motion: Approve the proposed regulations change to 12 AAC 56 115(c).

Moved by: Captain Antonsen

Seconded by: Mr. Rueter

The regulation was passed with no further discussion.

Agenda Item 4 Business Items

- 09:16
- Board Quarterly Revenue and Expense Report: Chair Thayer reviewed third quarter Board revenues and expenses. Chair Thayer explained that the Board revenue and expense report gives history of expenditure through the years. He stated that there are more fees because it's a two-year license. Chair Thayer stated that expenses are down and income is holding. Chair Thayer asked how many license renewals are expected in the fourth quarter, and the MPC stated she would investigate further. Chair Thayer explained that personal services are lower and travel is lower from previous years and that contractual service is dramatically down. Chair Thayer stated that the change is from the Department of Law's availability on the phone vs. flying the Attorney General to the meetings and being billed for her hours. He further explained that supplies and equipment are minimal and that indirect expenditures are on the upswing a little and should flatten out. He stated the Board had a surplus of \$112,000 and an accumulative surplus of \$60,000. He continued that the Board still had a quarter to go and FY2011 had \$35,000 in surplus and \$2,800 in FY09. Chair Thayer asked the Board if there were any questions, and there were none.
- b) <u>Correspondence</u>: Chair Thayer reviewed correspondence included in the Board packet. Chair Thayer directed the Board to read through a letter from Captain Gurry sent to the MPC in December 2012, a follow-up letter, and the response from the MPC to Captain Gurry that was done in July after the Board meeting. Since the letter was sent, the Chair confirmed with the MPC that there was no more correspondence. Captain Arzt questioned if the letter sent in July went through the Department of Law and the MPC said that it did.

The Chair briefed the Board that a question was raised this summer in July that Russian swimmers with two support vessels were attempting to swim the Bering Sea and that the vessels did not have pilots onboard. With the help of the Attorney General's office, the swimmers and sponsors were notified that they needed to have pilotage in Alaska waters. At the same time, the Board talked to the State Department and the Coast Guard and both had a hands-off approach. The Coast Guard was told by the State not to be involved. The Chair stated that the Board

did their part by notifying them. The MPC confirmed that nothing was received from either party. The Chair stated that the complaint came to the MPC verbally and that complaints are requested to be in writing. Mr. Reuter asked if it can be proven the vessel was within three nautical miles on land. The MPC stated that she believed so but the only information was through Facebook and no contact was made with the vessel or the shoreside support. Based on pictures posted on Facebook, the MPC does believe the vessels were within three miles.

Agenda Item 5 Association Reports

09:23

a) SEAPA: Chair Thayer went through SEAPA's operating rules and bylaws. Captain Ed Sinclair and Captain Paul Merrill represented SEAPA. The Chair requested Captain Merrill to discuss a summary of the changes and then go through the changes page by page. Captain Merrill summarized the changes by saying that 2007 was the last time that volume one of their training manual was updated and that there was no provision for marine pilot transfers in their selection process in other Alaska regions. SEAPA wanted to change their training manual so that a qualified pilot from Alaska didn't have to go through the same selection process as someone else without Alaska pilot experience and capability. SEAPA also wanted to remove the three-year restriction on the list of candidates and hold a different selection process. Captain Merrill stated that, as the training manual is currently written, ten people may pass the selection process but positions for three might exist. As it was written now, the extra seven would be kept in order on a list for three years. SEAPA wanted to remove the three year restriction to have more flexibility.

Captain Merrill also explained that SEAPA wanted to explicitly state that for a candidate to apply for the training program and selection process, a candidate must prove they are eligible for Coast Guard licensure. Otherwise, if they are brought into SEAPA, State law says they must have federal pilotage on their license and SEAPA wants to make sure the candidate has federal pilotage first. Captain Merrill called attention to the change in the table of contents where the cross-region transfer was described. Captain Merrill explained that page 2 of 14 contained basic minor language changes and confirmed Mr. Erickson's question that there were no language additions. Captain Merrill explained that the lighter font was new information and the crossed out font was deleted information. Captain Merrill stated that page 3 was changed language that impacted the differential cross region and deputy marine pilot training program. Captain Merrill stated that page 4 is the State of Alaska cross-regional transfer category and denoted which chapters would apply to which candidate. He stated that page 5 had simplified language and that item 3 in part 3 required pilots to show proof of Coast Guard federal licensure in Southeast Alaska and that he had met with the Coast Guard federal licensure program in Juneau and that they could give an assessment of a candidate to SEAPA if the candidate would qualify as a member

> of SEAPA. Page 6 had minor changes that stated a candidate needed a minimal score to pass. Captain Antonsen asked if the requirement of a minimal maritime experience score was new or moved from a different area. Captain Merrill stated that the language was clarifying. Captain Antonsen requested if that placed a floor to score candidates so that if there is a request for six candidates and seven apply, there is a scoring floor that is set by the training committee. Captain Merrill said yes. Captain Merrill said that page 7 had changes of the part numbers that referred to the location of new parts of the experience matrix. Captain Merrill said that the new language on page 8 was to standardize the way candidates and SEAPA verify information submitted on their experience level. He continued that page 10 had different part numbers that had changed and that page 11 set the standards of the minimal score for passing. He also stated that page 12 gave clarifying language to give candidates 30 days to make their decision if they want to begin training with SEAPA or to allow candidates to maintain position on the list if they cannot begin training immediately. This would also apply to candidates that had to pass on the training opportunity but would not go to the bottom of the list or be denied a training position.

> Captain Merrill explained that the last page defined instructions to someone who had passed exams and was waiting on the list and was an "unselected candidate". The Chair asked how people were selected. Captain Merrill said that people were ranked according to their score and they would take the top three that were available. Chair Thayer asked what happened to new people added to the list, and Captain Merrill said that there are no people added to the list until the list is exhausted. Captain Antonsen asked if the weighting of the scale on page 11 in Candidate Selection in experience had changed and had factored into the minimum score. Captain Sinclair stated that the minimum score is determined by the testing facility and the scenarios they use.

Mr. Richmond asked what the candidate cost was associated with testing such as the physical exam and bridge testing. Captain Merrill said he wasn't involved in the last round, though he believed candidates paid for their simulator time. Captain Merrill said he was unsure on the dollar amount and that it would be determined by the amount of candidates taking the exam. Captain Antonsen explained that there is no fee to take the exam, however a candidate has to pay travel costs and extra simulator time. Captain Antonsen stated that the pilot association does not control the amount of people who apply to take the exam in that they advertise for a large candidate pool and that it can cost the pilot association thousands of dollars to create an exam. Captain Arzt wanted to know who paid for the simulation time to administer the exam. Captain Sinclair said the simulator time was paid by dividing up the payment among candidates and that candidates had to pay for their own physical exam.

> Mr. Schrock requested clarification on leaving people on the list indefinitely. Captain Merrill said that if the list becomes stale, there would be another round of exams, and a new list would be generated from that. Mr. Schrock requested that SEAPA make that clear in their training manuals so that future pilots cannot claim they were unfairly removed from the list. Captain Arzt asked if individual candidates could pay for an examination or if they had to wait for a mass examination paid for the pilot association. Captain Merrill stated that examinations had to be scheduled en mass. Captain Sinclair clarified that if SEAPA needed to create a list, they would create an exam and gather candidates. Mr. Richmond wanted to know if all candidates are automatically selected for the training process. Captain Sinclair said that everyone that passes the exam will be on the list, but SEAPA is not obligated to take everyone into the training program. Mr. Richmond asked that if he wanted to become a pilot on the training program, did he still need to be accepted into the association to take the test? Captain Arzt explained that the minimum standard was for candidates to have federal and state pilotage qualifications. Captain Antonsen asked if individuals could still rent simulator time to get familiar with how simulators operate. Captain Antonsen asked if the association was interested in making a minor amendment to address that the list will stay valid until a new test is given. Captain Arzt said it was already written in section 12d. Mr. Schrock confirmed that a new amendment wasn't needed, he just wanted to make sure it was well understood in how the Board was understanding this. Captain Antonsen said that it allows the organization to hold another exam to repopulate the list.

Motion: Approve SEAPA's updated training plan.

Moved by: Captain Arzt Seconded by: Mr. Richmond

Captain Antonsen	yes
Captain Arzt	yes
Mr. Richmond	yes
Mr. Erickson	yes
Mr. Rueter	yes
Mr. Schrock	yes
Mr. Thayer	yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the proposed changes to the training plan 7 - 0.

Captain Sinclair discussed the summary of the operating rule section 1.F in the inclusion of Haines as a dispatch port as an internal management policy. He stated that Section 1.I revised the procedure on missed dispatch pay forfeiture if a pilot cannot make his or her dispatch. Section I and J revised rules of emergency

personnel and emergency time off, which increased from three days to five and limited it to once a year. Captain Sinclair stated that section 1.L discussed compensation per pilot per day when called to work when they weren't on the roster from \$600 to \$1000. The next change that SEAPA requested was the definitions to be included in bylaws.

Mr. Richmond asked how many pilots resided in Haines. Captain Sinclair said one. Mr. Richmond asked if 8 – 10 years ago if Ketchikan used to be the only dispatch center. Captain Sinclair said he didn't know for how many years it was. but he confirmed that Ketchikan was the lone dispatch point for many years. Mr. Richmond asked why the dispatch point was extended to Juneau. Captain Sinclair said it was for the efficiency of dispatch to board pilots at Cape Spencer or Cape Cornwallis and the increase of boat traffic. Mr. Richmond asked if the changes had anything to do with the amount of pilots that lived in Juneau, and Captain Sinclair said he wasn't aware of that. Mr. Richmond asked how many pilots lived in Juneau, and Captain Sinclair said about six. Mr. Richmond asked if there were any savings to industry to have a dispatch center in Juneau and Haines. Captain Sinclair said it could be depending on the ports and, that in some cases, it could be cheaper. Mr. Richmond asked if it was a consideration to dispatch pilots based on their location to save money. Mr. Richmond asked what other benefits there were to having a dispatch point in Haines. Captain Sinclair that said the pilot that lives in Haines gets credit for their time traveling to and from the ship. Mr. Richmond asked if the pilot associations would ever open it up to other ports, using Sitka as the example. Captain Sinclair said their association and published rates do not preclude certain areas.

Mr. Richmond said he was confused if industry or the individual pilot was paying for their travel expenses. Captain Sinclair said the published rate allowed for pilot reimbursement for travel. Captain Sinclair said the travel expenses are collected from industry and then divided up among the pilots. Captain Sinclair reminded everyone that this was an internal document. Mr. Rueter asked how many voyages have been dispatched under the published tariff that utilized this and when did SEAPA actively start that dispatch point based on the published tariff? Captain Sinclair said that since from at least 2012-2013 that published rates did not limit point of dispatches. Mr. Rueter asked again how many times in the 2012-2013 season had a dispatch taken place where the pilot charged transportation based on the published rate. Captain Sinclair said there are 20 – 25 dispatches per pilot per summer. Mr. Rueter asked if any were under the published rate and Captain Sinclair said all of them were. Captain Arzt explained that the document was operating rules within SEAPA and had nothing to do with published rates within industry and did not personally care how SEAPA reimbursed their pilots, and that this document did not impact how much the customer paid. He argued that how the pilot is paid by the association is different than how the money is collected from the customer. Mr. Richmond said that this person being dispatched from

Haines to board a ship in Ketchikan would cost more in that there is an extra expense to fly the person an extra step. Mr. Richmond asked if it was more expensive for the pilot to travel from Haines and Juneau than from Ketchikan. Captain Sinclair read from the published rate from paragraph G from SEAPA's cruise rates that a pilot could charge for transportation.

Captain Sinclair explained that if Haines isn't included, the pilot from Haines will have a different day count than the other pilots, and this directly results in impacting the share of profits to each pilot. Captain Antonsen said that he agreed with Captain Arzt that this was an internal document and shouldn't be discussed at the Board of Marine Pilots meeting and that he didn't see where it addressed industry costs at all. Mr. Schrock said he was unclear if this was within the Board of Marine Pilots' jurisdiction and requested Captain Sinclair or Captain Merrill to explain why this internal management issue was important to the Board. Mr. Rueter wanted to make sure it wouldn't back-door into an issue that was at the Board of Marine Pilots' level. Captain Sinclair explained that, internally, this gives credit to the person for their travel time when it comes to fair and equitable dispatch time. If Haines is not included as a dispatch point, that pilot could be traveling to and from ships and not receive credit when it came to balancing dispatch for the month, which related to evening out the earnings each month. Mr. Rueter asked what would stop every community in which someone might want to live from becoming a dispatch point. Captain Sinclair said that the association could agree not to include a town. Captain Sinclair said he's proven the transportation service out of Haines is viable and to get a person from Haines to a ship does not take an extra three days of travel, like what might happen if someone lived in a different community. Mr. Erickson said that he believed that the Board was asking industry to pay the additional expense for the person to live in Haines to be dispatched, and Captain Sinclair said that SEAPA was asking permission for an internal document to have Haines listed as a dispatch port. Captain Sinclair said the published rate with industry already included all ports and that there is no restriction from where the pilot traveled. Mr. Erickson said he still thought industry was paying for the pilot to travel from Haines.

Mr. Richmond asked if they could discuss paragraph G. He stated that his interpretation of paragraph G was that a pilot would accrue more travel expenses traveling from Haines to Juneau, and asked who paid that fund. He stated that anyone traveling form Haines would have higher fees overall than someone coming from Juneau. Mr. Richmond asked if the pilot would get an additional per diem rate since he had to leave a few days early to meet the vessel. Captain Sinclair said not necessarily, but Mr. Richmond said there was a potential. Mr. Richmond said, externally, it looked like an industry vessel would have to pay extra for a pilot from Haines than Juneau. Captain Sinclair stated that SEAPA had a two flight rule, so that pilots fly one flight early in case of weather and it gives the organization extra time to schedule a pilot if the pilot cannot travel in time. If

a pilot chooses to go three flights early, a pilot may not charge for that time. Captain Arzt said that the Board was not there to renegotiate the current tariffs and that paragraph G did not state Ketchikan or Juneau as designated dispatch ports and that industry was already paying for the pilots' travel regardless of where the pilot came from. Captain Arzt said this was an internal document and wanted to know if under the internal operating rules, where it excludes Haines for the individual pilot compensation so the pilot needed to be added in. Mr. Richmond asked if the Board of Marine Pilots' approval was even needed. Captain Sinclair said he thought SEAPA had handcuffed themselves by listing only two ports. Mr. Rueter asked how many pilots resided outside of Juneau or Ketchikan, and Captain Sinclair said one.

Chairman Thayer asked if there were any pilots that lived outside the State of Alaska. Captain Sinclair said that during the summer, all pilots live in Region I. One pilot lives in Haines and the others are split between Juneau and Ketchikan. Mr. Rueter asked, of the summer pilots that live outside the state, how are they treated and what is their dispatch point? Captain Sinclair said that pilots aren't compensentated to travel to Ketchikan from the Lower 48; that it would be their own expense. Mr. Schrock said he understood they were not debating the tariff but said if this change is not made, there is no disincentive to make more and more dispatch centers. Mr. Schrock said he thought this could become a bigger issue in that pilots could choose to live in the Lower 48, and that compensation within SEAPA meant pilots were getting a "bigger piece of the pie". Mr. Schrock said that it written as a disincentive for pilots living in different places, and if the disincentive was removed, this could start the process of pilots living in different places, all of which had costs that would be passed along to industry. Captain Antonsen said that this is an internal document and the dynamics of dispatching will impact how dispatching is done, and in some places, it would be cheaper to have pilots dispatched from a smaller port. Chairman Thayer asked if there were any more discussion and questions for SEAPA on the operating rules. Chairman Thayer discussed if the Board would like to move the bylaws definitions and operating rules into one motion or to bifurcate them. Mr. Richmond said he would like to bifurcate the issue. Captain Arzt requested to clarify the motion and the Board decided they were voting on the Article 12 bylaws definition, not the operating agreement. Chair Thayer asked if there was any discussion before coming to a vote.

Motion: Approve SEAPA's bylaws amendments.

Moved by: Mr. Richmond Seconded by: Captain Arzt

Captain Antonsen	yes
Captain Arzt	yes
Mr. Richmond	yes
Mr. Erickson	yes
Mr. Rueter	yes
Mr. Schrock	yes
Mr. Thayer	yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the proposed changes to the bylaws 7 - 0.

Chair Thayer asked if there was any discussion on the operating rules of SEAPA. Mr. Schrock moved the discussion, Captain Arzt seconded it. Mr. Erickson asked to amend the motion to accept the operating rules except section F where it specifies Haines, so that it reads that dispatch ports can only include Ketchikan and Juneau. Mr. Schrock said he'd prefer his motion stand as a standalone movement. Mr. Richmond seconded the motion. Captain Antonsen clarified that voting "yes" would mean that Haines was not listed as a dispatch point.

Motion: Approve the amendment to the motion to approve SEAPA's Operating Agreement to remove Haines as a dispatch point.

Moved by: Mr. Schrock Seconded by: Mr. Richmond

Captain Antonsen	no
Captain Arzt	yes
Mr. Richmond	yes
Mr. Erickson	yes
Mr. Rueter	yes
Mr. Schrock	yes
Mr. Thayer	yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the proposed changes to the operating agreement 6-1.

Motion: Approve SEAPA's operating rules with the exception of section F, Haines dispatch point, which was removed as part of a previous motion.

Moved by: Unclear Seconded by: Unclear

Captain Antonsen yes
Captain Arzt yes
Mr. Richmond yes
Mr. Erickson yes
Mr. Rueter yes
Mr. Schrock yes
Mr. Thayer yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the proposed changes to the operating agreement as amended 7-0.

Chair Thayer removed the SEAPA rate change from the agenda.

- b) Chair Thayer invited SWAPA to the table. Ms. Jenni Zielinski represented SWAPA. Chair Thayer acknowledged SWAPA's rate change and Ms. Zielinski said the rate change was still out for public review. Chair Thayer confirmed with Ms. Zielinski that Captain Wakefield had completed the movements in Seward. Ms. Zielinski confirmed that urinalysis had been completed and that there was nothing more to pass.
- c) Chair Thayer called AMP to the table. Captain Christie, president of AMP, walked the Board through the changes to their operating agreements to change language on how to calculate pay for association members. He said on paragraph 3. A.1, language was changed to define work days, and then to strike "work rules" and rename it "policy". Captain Christie also called out section 3 paragraph a.2 to change language and a change on section 3.a.3 on how members of AMP are paid. Captain Antonsen requested a more friendly way to observe changes in documents and Chair Thayer requested colored font to designate changes. Chair Thayer asked for questions and discussion.

Motion: Approve AMP's changes to their operating agreements.

Moved by: Mr. Schrock
Seconded by: Captain Antonsen

Mr. Thayer called for unanimous consent and it passed 7-0.

Agenda Item 6 Public Comment

10:45

The Chair asked for public comment. Mr. Jim Wright from AVTEC in Seattle addressed the Board. He stated that after the M/V COSTCO BUSAN incident, the ADA decided pilots needed more time on electronic chart display and information systems (ECDIS) and that most simulator schools are developing courses on ECDIS. He stated that the AVTEC course was unique in that the other courses are PC-based and AVTEC course is full bridge simulator based. AVTEC did a beta course in the spring with representatives from the three pilot regions. He stated that AVTEC would like to encourage pilots from all regions to continue their involvement. He stated he believed the maritime industry was going the same way as the aviation industry, and Mr. Wright believed pilots should front-run and lead simulator training instead of being dragged by state or industry. Mr. Wright stated that AVTEC had done a great job running this program and requested the Board encourage pilots to become more involved. Chair Thayer thanked Mr. Wright for speaking and that the Board was familiar with AVTEC. Captain Arzt said that he took the AVTEC course and was impressed with the program and that pilots have appreciated the training. Mr. Wright said he'd like to encourage as much Region I, Region II, and Region III input as possible.

Chair Thayer also thanked SEAPA and Alaska Cruise Line Agency for placing the MPC on a vessel to give her some first-hand knowledge and that Chair Thayer enjoyed observing marine pilot operations onboard the Golden Princess from Ketchikan to Juneau. Chair Thayer stated he learned from the different but complimentary styles of the pilots.

Agenda Item 7 Next Meeting

10:50

Chair Thayer requested where the next meeting should be held. Captain Antonsen said he would prefer the January meeting be held towards the end of January since it would schedule well around other meetings for pilots and for Anchorage events. Captain Antonsen said it encourages more public comment in Anchorage or Juneau and that he prefers Anchorage. Chair Thayer requested Thursday January 30 in Anchorage and that the Board should consider where they would like the Spring meeting. The Board agreed that January 30 in Anchorage would be a tentative date. Mr. Erickson recommended that the spring meeting be held in Southeast, specifically requesting Juneau. The Board agreed on the tentative dates of meeting in 22-24 April, 2014 in Juneau.

Mr. Erickson made the motion, seconded by Mr. Schrock, and it was unanimously decided to move the Board into Executive Session under AS 44.62.310 Open Meeting Act for the purpose of subject's undue prejudice, reputation, and character of any persons provided the person may request a public discussion.

Chair Thayer put the Board into recess until 11:00. The Board went into Executive Session at 11:15.

Agenda Item 8 Executive Session

12:25 The Board came out of executive session at 12: 25.

Motion: Approve awarding of Deputy Pilot license #211 to Captain Andrew Wakefield, SWAPA.

Moved by: Captain Arzt Seconded by: Mr. Reuter

Captain Antonsen yes
Captain Arzt yes
Mr. Richmond yes
Mr. Erickson yes
Mr. Rueter yes
Mr. Schrock yes
Mr. Thayer yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the qualification of Captain Wakefield 7-0.

Chair Thayer requested a roll-call vote to take action against Greenpeace and the R/V ESPERANZA coming into State waters off Point Hope in July, 2012, without a marine pilot. Chair Thayer asked for discussion and there was none. Mr. Richmond requested a line to the fine letter adding how R/V ESPERANZA should pay via check and that vessels will react quicker to the letter if the vessel could get arrested. Mr. Schrock stated for the record that there was a clear violation and that the question is how to proceed.

Motion: Adopt and revise the fine letter to approve the changes that were discussed for the maximum of a \$15,000 fine.

Moved by: Mr. Erickson Seconded by: Mr. Schrock

Captain Antonsen yes
Captain Arzt yes
Mr. Richmond yes
Mr. Erickson yes
Mr. Rueter yes

Mr. Schrock

yes

Mr. Thayer

yes

Mr. Thayer called for a roll-call vote and the Board APPROVED the motion 7-0.

On a motion by Mr. Erickson, seconded by Mr. Richmond, and carried without dissent, the Board RESQLVED to adjourn at 12:36pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Crysta Dooley

Marine Pilot Coordinator

Curtis Thayer

Chairman