

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

\* \* \* \* \*

Investigation of:

\*

\*

M/V *CONTI PERIDOT* COLLISION WITH

\*

THE M/T *CARLA MAERSK* IN THE

\*

HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL

\*

MARCH 9, 2015

\*

\*

Docket No.: DCA-15-MM-017

\* \* \* \* \*

Interview of: JANIECE LONGORIA and  
MARCUS WOODRINGTuesday,  
July 28, 2015

The above-captioned matter convened, pursuant to notice.

BEFORE: ROB JONES  
Senior Marine Accident Investigator

## APPEARANCES:

ROB JONES, Senior Marine Accident Investigator  
National Transportation Safety Board

ERIC STOLZENBERG, Investigator-in-Charge  
National Transportation Safety Board

CARRIE BELL, Accident Investigator  
National Transportation Safety Board

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>I N D E X</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Interview of Janiece Longoria and Marcus Woodring:		
By Mr. Jones		4
By Ms. Bell		20
By Mr. Stolzenberg		24
By Mr. [REDACTED]		38
By Mr. Jones		44
By Mr. [REDACTED]		50
By Ms. Bell		52
By Mr. Stolzenberg		58

MS. LONGORIA: Yes.

With me today is?

10

\_\_\_\_\_

██████████ BELL: Carrie Bell, NTSB.

13 MR. STOLZENBERG: Eric Stolzenberg, NTSB.

14 INTERVIEW OF JANIECE LONGORIA AND MARCUS WOODRING

15 MR. JONES: And I'll start off with you, Chairman. I  
16 appreciate you being here, and I also would like to say we really  
17 appreciate the invitation today to sit in on the -- on your  
18 meeting. It was very informative. It probably answered more  
19 questions for us that we would have had, just by sitting there,  
20 and it was really a pleasure to be there.

21           If you could just -- your background, just quickly,  
22   becoming Port Commission chairman and how you oversee the Pilot  
23   Commission, and what you think -- you feel your duties are there  
24   and how you best oversee the pilots and the commission?

25 MS. LONGORIA: So why don't we break it up, because I'll

1 forget.

2 MR. JONES: Okay. Okay.

3 MS. LONGORIA: But let me start with my background.

4 MR. JONES: Sure.

5 MS. LONGORIA: I'm a lawyer by profession and training.  
6 I graduated University of Texas School of Law in 1979, and I  
7 started my practice in Houston, Texas. I started off in the  
8 Harris County District Attorney's Office as a prosecutor. And  
9 once I got the requisite number of trials under my belt, I joined  
10 a civil litigation firm in their securities litigation group. And  
11 I've practiced continuously in commercial litigation since about  
12 1988. I am currently with the firm of Ogden, Gibson, Broocks,  
13 Longoria & Hall, LLP, here in Houston. And I've been with that  
14 firm since 1997.

15 I joined the Port of Houston Commission in 2002. I was  
16 appointed by the City of Houston. And I don't know if you know  
17 how our appointments work, but there are two commissioners  
18 appointed by the City of Houston, two appointed by Harris County,  
19 and then one appointed by Pasadena, and then one appointed by the  
20 Mayors and Councils organization, which includes all of the small  
21 cities that are impacted by the Port of Houston Authority.

22 The chairman of the Port of Houston Commission is  
23 jointly appointed by Harris County and the City of Houston. So I  
24 was originally appointed to the commission by the City of Houston  
25 in 2002. And I was reappointed every 2 years -- they're 2-year

1 terms -- through 2010. And then in 2013, January, I was appointed  
2 jointly by the City of Houston and Harris County to chair the  
3 commission.

4 MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you. With your duties as  
5 chairman, do you -- the pilots or their resumes, so to speak, are  
6 they brought to your attention when they're apprentices and their  
7 backgrounds, and do you sign off on their commission?

8 MS. LONGORIA: Well, by statute, you know that the pilot  
9 -- the pilots are a separately organized institution under state  
10 law. And also under state law, the commissioners that serve for  
11 the Port of Houston Authority are also, by virtue of their  
12 position, they become commissioners of the Pilot Board. So  
13 they're part of the Pilot Board. And as chairman of the Port of  
14 Houston Commission, then I am the chairman of the Pilot Board.

15 And we are an organization that has oversight over the  
16 Houston Pilots in several areas. We have an Application Review  
17 Committee that does the same kind of investigation and the same  
18 work that we delegate to experts in that area. They bring their  
19 findings to the Pilot Board Commission and make recommendations to  
20 us. And then we act depending on what we believe the appropriate  
21 outcome is on the applications and licensing and any disciplinary  
22 matters that may come to our attention.

23 And then, of course, we have this accident review  
24 oversight, which, again, we delegate to experts in the field, the  
25 Pilot Board Investigative Recommendation Committee, where, as you

1 heard today, is composed of people that have significant  
2 experience with maritime matters. And I think you heard today  
3 that this Pilot Board Investigation and Recommendation Committee  
4 has, together, 300 years of experience in maritime.

5           So we delegate that underlying investigation review to  
6 that committee. They do their review and they bring to the Pilot  
7 Board, as you heard today, matters for our consideration and  
8 potential action. And they generally make a recommendation. And  
9 as you heard today, on one of those matters there was significant  
10 discussion about it, and on the other two, of course, we talked  
11 about it, but there was less discussion about the recommendations  
12 that were made.

13           MR. JONES: And it was very interesting to listen to  
14 that discussion. Would you say that's more the norm, less the  
15 norm, the type of discussion when the Pilot Board brings a  
16 accident to your table like that?

17           MS. LONGORIA: Every accident is unique and every one is  
18 different, so I can't say that there's anything that's  
19 particularly normal, you know? Every one is considered  
20 thoroughly, investigated thoroughly, and the Pilot Board, I  
21 believe, discharges its responsibility to execute its oversight  
22 and to make an appropriate finding and decision.

23           MR. JONES: You might have answered me -- I might have  
24 asked it wrong, but I was just wondering about the discussion that  
25 we saw today, which was good. The first accident, there was some

1 discussion amongst the board and the second two were more or less  
2 -- less discussion. But I was -- that kind of discussion is --

3 MS. LONGORIA: Well, but we did discuss it and we did  
4 ask questions of Mr. Woodring and other -- and others --

5 MR. JONES: Um-hum.

6 MS. LONGORIA: -- you know, and talked about, well, this  
7 is what happened and why would you have letters of caution here  
8 and not here and --

9 MR. JONES: Right.

10 MS. LONGORIA: You know, and so there was. I think that  
11 the difference is that with the accident between the *Summer Wind*  
12 and the *Susan, Miss Susan*, you may remember that there was a spill  
13 in the channel that created -- there was quite a bit of public  
14 outcry about that.

15 MR. JONES: Sure.

16 MS. LONGORIA: And so, you know, the Pilot Board  
17 Investigative Review Committee takes that very seriously, as we  
18 do.

19 MR. JONES: Um-hum.

20 MS. LONGORIA: And so we just want to be sure that we  
21 are -- in an instance where there was, you know, 144,000 gallons  
22 of oil that was spilled in the channel, that we're doing a very  
23 thorough review in making the appropriate decision.

24 MR. JONES: Okay.

25 MS. LONGORIA: You know, that's different from losing a



1 rudder, in the second case, or steerage.

2 MR. JONES: Yes. I just --

3 MS. LONGORIA: It's just not the same level of concern.

4 MR. JONES: Sure. I understand.

5 Marcus, I think --

6 MR. WOODRING: Can I introduce myself for the record?

7 MS. LONGORIA: Yeah. Please, please --

8 MR. JONES: Sure, sure. Go ahead and --

9 MR. WOODRING: I just wanted to add something. Captain  
10 Marcus Woodring. I'm the HSSE director, Health, Safety, Security,  
11 Emergency Management director here at the Port of Houston  
12 Authority. Been here 4 years, entering my third year as chairman  
13 of the PBIRC, and prior to that, 28 years in the U.S. Coast Guard,  
14 including 7 years at sea, captain of a Coast Guard cutter, and  
15 retired out of Houston as captain of the port.

16 Just to expand a little bit upon one of the cases, the  
17 process for the cases, there are some cases that the PBIRC reviews  
18 -- all incidents involving the pilots come to the PBIRC. And we  
19 have a subcommittee that reviews all those cases, a subcommittee  
20 of five of the nine members, to determine if they warrant a full  
21 hearing. And in that case, it's almost a mechanical versus a  
22 human factor delineation. The rudder fell off. Was the pilot  
23 responsible for that? The ship got hit by a meteorite. Was the  
24 pilot responsible for that? If there is any indication there  
25 might be a human factor involved, then normally those go to a full

1 hearing.

2           So the subcommittee in the past, since I've been the  
3 chairman since January of '13, about 30 months, we've reviewed 30  
4 cases. Not all those cases go to a full hearing. Nine of those  
5 have gone to a full hearing.

6           So when the chairman sees something, there's some things  
7 that are taken care of before it gets to the Pilot Board  
8 Commission for action, and there are other ones that once they go  
9 to the full hearing, then the recommendation is made to the Pilot  
10 Board as to what action to take. But there's -- it's a fairly  
11 clear delineation in the subcommittee.

12           MR. JONES: Okay. So what -- say, with the matter at  
13 hand because -- the *Conti Peridot* and the *Carla Maersk*. So what  
14 is the next iteration for the PBIRC regarding those two pilots in  
15 your investigation?

16           MR. WOODRING: Right now, Captain Mike Usher, who is our  
17 compliance coordinator for the Port of Houston Authority, he works  
18 for our legal department. He is currently investigating and  
19 gathering all the materials that he can on that case, from  
20 interviews to deck logs to ship's logs, anything the Coast Guard  
21 can share, anything the companies care to share, and he compiles a  
22 package. We are meeting on August 13th or 18th -- I can't  
23 remember -- for our next subcommittee, and we're reviewing five  
24 cases. One of those five cases is the *Conti Peridot* and the *Carla*  
25 *Maersk*. Another one is the *Chembulk Houston* and the *Monte Alegre*.

1 There's two others that were loss of propulsion, and there was  
2 another one that was an allision with a dock. And so we'll look  
3 at those five cases and see where the human factors came in and  
4 whether there's any possibility the pilot may not have acted with  
5 prudent seamanship, in which case we'll convene a full hearing  
6 probably 6 to 8 weeks after the subcommittee.

7 MR. JONES: Okay. And, Chairman, during your tenure,  
8 have any of the pilot incidences been -- during that -- when  
9 they've been brought to your board, was any of the -- have any of  
10 the pilots' commissions been revoked or anything more than a  
11 letter of caution that we heard today that you're aware of or know  
12 of?

13 MS. LONGORIA: I can't remember.

14 MR. JONES: Okay.

15 MS. LONGORIA: But I would say that a lot of that, I  
16 know that the pilot, the pilots themselves do their own internal  
17 policing. And so if they believe that a pilot has done something  
18 that is not consistent with licensing, there have been instances  
19 that I'm aware of where they take proactive steps to either have  
20 that pilot resign or to revoke his license or whatever they think  
21 is appropriate. So it doesn't always bubble up to the Pilot Board  
22 to do that.

23 MR. JONES: Okay. But that would be brought to your --  
24 if you don't hear about it, it's brought to your attention at one  
25 of the boards you just saw today just to let you know the state of

1     affairs or that it's gone on?

2             MS. LONGORIA:  It's not necessarily brought to the  
3     attention of the Pilot Board, is what I'm saying.

4             MR. JONES:  Okay.

5             MR. WOODRING:  Normally, what I'll do is I'll make sure  
6     that's included in the briefing notes for the Pilot Commission  
7     meeting or in closed session, because it has been resolved, I will  
8     give the Pilot Board a quick briefing on it.

9             MR. JONES:  Okay.  And it was nice to see a reference in  
10    our report today.  It's nice to know others read it.

11            MS. LONGORIA:  I read the whole thing.  You notice that  
12    I quoted quite a bit --

13            MR. JONES:  Yup, you did.

14            MS. LONGORIA:  -- of what you had in your report.

15            MR. JONES:  Did you by any --

16            MS. LONGORIA:  I thought it was well crafted, by the  
17    way.

18            MR. JONES:  Good.  Thank you.  Well, everybody -- it was  
19    a team effort by everybody.  I don't want to say thank you, but --  
20    we have writers, and everybody -- it's a big collaboration.  Along  
21    with if you'd ever seen one of our board meetings, actually, they  
22    -- where they're telecast.  There's usually a link you can go on,  
23    and it's -- it can be quite an interesting event.

24            But going back to -- do you remember the *Elka Apollon*  
25    accident, which was a few years ago?

1 MS. LONGORIA: I do not.

2 MR. JONES: Okay. I was just wondering if you'd read  
3 that report or --

4 MS. LONGORIA: No.

5 MR. JONES: Okay.

6 MS. LONGORIA: What year was that?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: '11.

8 MR. WOODRING: The other ship involved was the  
9 *Nederland*. You probably remember -- the *Nederland* probably rings  
10 a bell.

11 MS. LONGORIA: What year was that?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2011.

13 MR. JONES: And then it was probably brought to the  
14 Board 2012.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it was October 2011.

16 MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

17 MR. WOODRING: Yeah, we heard the case. That was the  
18 first case I heard in early '13 --

19 MS. LONGORIA: Yeah.

20 MR. WOODRING: -- shortly after you became chairman.

21 MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

22 MR. WOODRING: It was a holdover from --

23 MS. LONGORIA: Yeah.

24 MR. WOODRING: -- the previous PBIRC chairman, and so we  
25 held the hearing on that one.

1 MR. JONES: Okay.

2 MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

3 MR. JONES: And the only reason I was referencing it was  
4 I was wondering if you had again referenced that report after or  
5 during the time that you were hearing from the PBIRC. So that was  
6 just a question, but if you don't remember, that's fine.

7 MS. LONGORIA: I just --

8 MR. JONES: No?

9 MS. LONGORIA: Sorry. There's been so much water under  
10 the bridge, so it's like --

11 MR. JONES: Sure. You know, Mike, we heard Mike Morris  
12 today talk to you, and I'd like to reiterate what Mike said.  
13 We've known each other for a while now, sadly, due to the  
14 circumstances of a couple accidents, but I do consider him a  
15 friend, too, and it's been great working with him and everybody  
16 down here. Everybody is very cooperative. We all have a job to  
17 do, and it really has been a great experience with -- working with  
18 Mike and Mike Usher, Marcus, so just -- I do want to --

19 MS. LONGORIA: I sleep well at night knowing that --

20 MR. JONES: Good.

21 MS. LONGORIA: -- that Captain Woodring is on the case.

22 MR. JONES: So but with Mike and the PBIRC's findings,  
23 and then our findings, or on our probable cause, does that ever --  
24 just the -- how do you account in your own mind for the  
25 differences that might be there when the evidence should basically

1 be the same that we're all gathering together? And just -- I'll  
2 just reiterate a little bit -- or expand a little bit longer.  
3 When we do an investigation down here, we form parties. So we use  
4 the Pilots Association. Mike Morris is a party to our  
5 investigation along with the Coast Guard, along with the operators  
6 of the two vessels. So like this one with the *Conti Peridot* -- or  
7 let's go back to the *Summer Wind*, Kirby Towing was a party to the  
8 investigation, Cleopatra shipping because --

9 MS. LONGORIA: The scope of your investigation is much  
10 more broad.

11 MR. JONES: Yeah.

12 MS. LONGORIA: Just by its nature. We don't have  
13 subpoena power.

14 MR. JONES: Right.

15 MS. LONGORIA: PBIRC doesn't have subpoena power. So  
16 it's really looking into the conduct of the pilot.

17 MR. JONES: Okay.

18 MS. LONGORIA: And we don't have access to the NTSB  
19 materials. We don't have access to the Coast Guard materials. We  
20 don't have access to Kirby. So the PBIRC is more restricted in  
21 what it is able to gather and look at in its investigation, even  
22 though I think it's very thorough. Because they examined, as you  
23 saw, in their findings, they were very clearly aligned with what  
24 you -- the conclusion that you also drew. And the only  
25 divergence, the only difference was you referenced speed and the

1 PBIRC did not.

2 MR. JONES: Right.

3 MS. LONGORIA: And I've heard today that the PBIRC  
4 believed that the speed was appropriate in light of the conditions  
5 then existing because the tanker had to maintain a particular  
6 speed in order to, you know, be in that narrow area of the  
7 channel. So there is even a difference of expert opinion on that  
8 piece.

9 MR. JONES: Yeah. That's just what I was wondering. So  
10 does that satisfy you as the chairman that, okay, experts are  
11 going to -- we're going to just have to agree to disagree, or does  
12 it cause you concern that an independent investigative body sent  
13 down here might have found something different than your  
14 investigative body?

15 MS. LONGORIA: I wouldn't say that it causes me concern,  
16 because at the end of the day, the Pilot Board takes into  
17 consideration all the information that it has available, including  
18 not only the Pilot Board Investigative Review Committee work,  
19 which I think is very thorough, but also we consider the NTSB  
20 report findings and probable cause in making a determination  
21 today. And although we had some disagreement on the Pilot Board  
22 about the outcome of that, we had a really full and fair  
23 discussion and everything was considered.

24 MR. JONES: And I like that interchange. That was very  
25 interesting to watch. It was very surprising. I enjoyed it.



1           But I'll pose this to Marcus. Are you allowed to --  
2 when our docket is open, do you use the information that's in our  
3 docket, the interviews and --

4           MR. WOODRING: Absolutely, absolutely. We'll gather any  
5 information humanly possible. We used to have an MOU with the  
6 U.S. Coast Guard back when I was the captain of the port that  
7 allowed for information sharing in a investigation concerning a  
8 pilot. And the goal there was to make sure that the waterway was  
9 safe. Unfortunately, I think it was around 2010 -- '09, '10,  
10 there was a JAG ruling that eliminated the ability for the Coast  
11 Guard to share information with the Pilot Board.

12          MS. LONGORIA: Which is unfortunate.

13          MR. WOODRING: Which is unfortunate for us. I think we  
14 have the same common goal in mind. I've lived this from both the  
15 Coast Guard side as captain of the port when this policy came  
16 down, and now living it from the other side on the Pilot Board.  
17 Our common goal is to keep the waterway safe.

18          What we were able to do is we were able to clarify the  
19 PII status with Coast Guard headquarters, and they changed their  
20 policy letter to specifically list pilot organizations, pilot -- I  
21 believe pilot oversight organizations, as an example of who could  
22 be a PII. And that has opened some more doors to Mike Usher to be  
23 able to gather a little bit more information that we couldn't  
24 before.

25          Probably the best thing we have in place is we've asked

1 the local Coast Guard to notify Mike Usher as soon as an accident  
2 happens on their call-out sheet as they notify the Coast Guard  
3 investigators. Mike Usher then can show up on scene concurrently  
4 with the Coast Guard, and if the captain is willing to give him  
5 the deck log or the bell log or a copy of this or a copy of that,  
6 we're good. Unfortunately, sometimes the captain is and sometimes  
7 the captain isn't willing to give that up to Mike. So we do the  
8 best we can with the limited resources we have.

9 If there was a bigger divergence on the findings in the  
10 *Summer Wind*, I might have been concerned. I did not find the  
11 divergence of opinions on that one large enough to give me pause  
12 and concern.

13 MR. JONES: Okay.

14 MS. LONGORIA: Well, especially in light of the fact  
15 that even though you had that in your probable cause statement,  
16 there was no action taken as a result of that with regard to the  
17 Houston Pilots.

18 MR. JONES: Right. And I think when [REDACTED] said about,  
19 you know, when we state going too fast, it's not that much of a  
20 recommendation, it's not that hard of a leap knowing the  
21 conditions just to go slower, and I think anybody that reads the  
22 report would realize, you know, that would be the solution.

23 MR. WOODRING: Right. And it's hard to tell on that day  
24 -- it was patchy fog, sea fog. It's hard to tell exactly where  
25 and when. But we're armchair quarterbacking a case that's passed.

1           MR. JONES: Right, exactly, exactly. I don't want to  
2 revisit the accident. But what I would like to do is, again,  
3 while I've got you both here is that -- and I know you weren't too  
4 -- remembrance of the *Elka Apollon*, but there was some cause for  
5 concern on our part as investigators when we're down here, and the  
6 pilot on the *Elka Apollon*, we -- I interviewed him personally.  
7 The transcripts are on the docket, and -- but then the -- when the  
8 Pilot Review Board interviewed him, or the PBIRC, he was not too  
9 appreciative of the NTSB products and/or the VDR transcript. And  
10 again, when we do investigations, it's not just myself, one  
11 investigator. It's a party. The transcripts are made from the  
12 VDR of party member --

13           MS. LONGORIA: What's a VDR?

14           MR. JONES: The VDR is the voyage data recorder.

15           MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

16           MR. JONES: So it's just the plane, the black box.

17           MS. LONGORIA: Yes, thank you.

18           MR. JONES: So when we get it from the scene, again, we  
19 enlist the parties, which are the Houston Pilots, the Coast Guard,  
20 and members from the -- that are all down there, and we all listen  
21 to it as a group and then transcribe it with everybody's  
22 agreement. If we can't hear the word, figure out the word, we  
23 don't put it down. That becomes public record. It's a transcript  
24 that gets in the docket. Now, one of the things the pilot of  
25 record had, you know, basically took issue with that and that was

1 in his testimony during the meeting.

2 So I was just wondering if there is any way -- you know,  
3 how do you question that? And I can ask Marcus. You know, how is  
4 that rectified if he's -- you know, do you agree with the  
5 testimony from the pilot or do you say, wait a minute, this is a  
6 transcription made by several individuals that are, you know,  
7 privy to the accident data. I was just -- how is that handled in  
8 a PBIRC investigation?

9 MR. WOODRING: I don't recall that specific incident  
10 with the *Elka Apollon*. I'd be hard-pressed to take a witness  
11 statement and then the pilot sitting at the other end of the table  
12 testifying under oath. It'd be awful hard to resolve that if he's  
13 saying this is the truth and you're saying that's the truth. We'd  
14 probably have to pause and go try to find out what the real truth  
15 is outside the room. But we do get conflicting information, as  
16 you do. In that particular case, I don't recall that specific  
17 incident.

18 MR. JONES: Okay. That's all I have right now. I'd  
19 like to just --

20 MR. [REDACTED] Yes.

21 MR. JONES: I don't know, Carrie -- well, let's go down  
22 our end first, then [REDACTED] you'll follow up.

23 [REDACTED] Okay.

24 MS. BELL: I just had a quick question about you  
25 mentioned the MOU with the Coast Guard, the sharing information.

1    So you used to have that and now you don't.  So what is -- do you  
2    -- what was behind the decision to stop that and what does that  
3    possibly do in terms of --

4               MS. LONGORIA:  I think their legal arm said no more.

5               MS. BELL:  And what -- for what reason would that be?

6               MS. LONGORIA:  You'd have to ask them, right?

7               MR. WOODRING:  I can get you a copy of the letter that  
8    they sent us or the email that they sent us.  Basically, it was a  
9    matter of they could not share the information before the case was  
10   closed.  So once the case was closed, then it could become public  
11   knowledge, but as it went through the process, they could not  
12   share their thoughts, opinions and things as it moved on.

13              MS. BELL:  So when the case is closed, then you'd have  
14   that information, but it's already closed?

15              MR. WOODRING:  That's correct.  And it takes a long time  
16   to close the cases.  I'm not going to throw stones, and again, I  
17   was in the Coast Guard, but it takes several years for the case to  
18   get closed, not only at the local level, but then once it's put  
19   into the system, headquarters has to hit the final button, and  
20   that can take upwards of a year, at least in my experience.

21              MS. LONGORIA:  And by the way, that's the reason that I  
22   abated decision on this -- on the *Summer Wind*/Miss Susan pending  
23   completion of the NTSB's investigation.  I really expected that to  
24   happen sooner than the Coast Guard, and I knew that your  
25   investigation would be comprehensive and that you had access to

1 materials that we did not have. So that's the reason in  
2 exercising my due diligence and the diligence of the Commission  
3 that we abated the proceeding until the conclusion of your  
4 investigation and the filing of the report.

5 MS. BELL: Thank you.

6 MR. WOODRING: And even though we do not have the MOU,  
7 another thing that I want to point out is we've invited the Coast  
8 Guard, you'll see in the PBIRC, that they are a nonvoting member.  
9 So they have been repeatedly invited not only to sit at the table  
10 during the hearings and ask questions of the pilot, but also to  
11 sit in the room when we deliberate and decide what the outcome  
12 should be. Unfortunately, again, their attorneys have not allowed  
13 them to do that. So that is a standing offer from us, and you'll  
14 see it on all the paperwork, that they are listed as a nonvoting  
15 member, and that's what it means. So we still continue from both  
16 sides to try to work through this issue, because again, we both  
17 have the same goal at heart, and that's to make the waterway safe.  
18 Unfortunately, there are some hurdles and roadblocks between us  
19 that make it a little less than transparent sometimes, and may, in  
20 the end, lead us to different conclusions because we have  
21 different data.

22 MR. [REDACTED] Let me step in there. This is [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. And we were talking about the -- being a  
24 member, nonvoting member of the board. Marcus and I have been  
25 working with this. Unfortunately, District 8 Legal, and I'm glad

1 to call them out on this tape, recommended that we -- recommended  
2 is the key word here -- that we not sit on the board. The Captain  
3 of the Port, Captain Penoyer, disagrees with D8 Legal. I disagree  
4 with them. And we are still trying to get this membership on the  
5 board so we can help because, as Captain Woodring said, we do have  
6 a congruent interest in keeping the waterway safe. But I'll pass  
7 it on.

8 MS. LONGORIA: Absolutely. I agree with you.

9 MR. WOODRING: And, for example, while we may not have  
10 access to their information, if their investigators were allowed  
11 on the board, they may have some knowledge or something -- I don't  
12 know -- that went on with the bridge team and may ask some pointed  
13 questions about the bridge team that we, as the PBIRC, do not have  
14 any information about, but they might be hearing something over  
15 here. And without revealing what that is to us, they might ask a  
16 couple questions down that line that, again, more value added,  
17 more transparency, more --

18 MS. BELL: Right. Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. LONGORIA: Well, let me underscore that, with this  
20 collision, the *Conti Peridot/Carla Maersk*, I don't want to confuse  
21 the non-sharing of this information, sort of the elimination of  
22 that MOU, with the collaboration that occurs when there's an  
23 accident, because the Coast Guard, Port of Houston Authority, and  
24 all of the local cities and their law enforcement units worked  
25 together seamlessly to address this collision, as they do all

1 collisions, and we couldn't have a better cooperation with the  
2 Coast Guard than we do.

3 MS. BELL: Um-hum.

4 MS. LONGORIA: We're very, very close with them from the  
5 standpoint of responding, being the first responders to these  
6 types of events.

7 MS. BELL: Um-hum.

8 MS. LONGORIA: And I gave them congratulations on the  
9 way they organized it and the way it was discharged. And as a  
10 result of everybody that came together, there was no loss of life.  
11 There was no -- there wasn't a fire. We didn't even lose any  
12 wildlife or fish. And so we were very proud that everybody came  
13 together to mitigate any potential impacts from that accident.

14 MS. BELL: Thank you.

15 MR. STOLZENBERG: Eric Stolzenberg, NTSB. I may not  
16 possess the knowledge of others in the room regarding the PBIRC,  
17 so I just, for a moment, how does the -- like for yourself,  
18 Marcus, how did you become to be chairman, and what's a typical  
19 path for a PBIRC member; how do they get on the board?

20 MS. LONGORIA: Well, I will respond first to say that  
21 the Pilot Board appoints the members of the Pilot Board  
22 Investigative Recommendation Committee every year. And you'll  
23 have to speak to how you became chairman.

24 MR. WOODRING: Yes, ma'am. The -- it's specified in the  
25 rules. There's several layers here. The first is a state law,



1    which is Chapter 66 of the Transportation Code, that tells the  
2    Pilot Commission what their duties are. One of the very first  
3    lines in that says you may make rules to adopt whatever you need  
4    to do to make this happen. So we have what are called the rules  
5    that work between us and the pilots on how this whole thing runs.  
6    It has the PBIRC process, the ARC process; all these things are  
7    laid out in there.

8               In there is also laid out the membership of each of  
9    these committees, and it specifies for the PBIRC that it shall be  
10   comprised of voting members from the Houston Pilots Association,  
11   the Port of Houston maritime industry, the Port of Houston  
12   Authority, and nonvoting advisory members from the Coast Guard.  
13   The other specification in there, it must be chaired by a port  
14   authority voting member, which in this case is me. The other  
15   chairman, my predecessor, retired at the end of 2012, and Chairman  
16   Longoria was --

17              MS. LONGORIA: Who was your predecessor?

18              MR. WOODRING: Ruben Arredondo.

19              MS. LONGORIA: That's right, yeah.

20              MR. WOODRING: And Ruben retired and the chairman was  
21   coming on. And so every year in January, sometimes in December or  
22   January, sometimes January, there are two RCAs, recommendation for  
23   commission actions, that are put forth to the Pilot Board. One  
24   was the PBIRC members; one was the ARC members for the year. And  
25   the Pilot Board approves those. There was a time in the past many

1 years ago that there are seven ARC members and there's seven  
2 commissioners. And at one time each commissioner picked a person  
3 so serve in their slot on the ARC. That has kind of gone away  
4 over the years and now they are more in alignment with the rules,  
5 in terms of being maritime experts. But clearly, the Pilot Board  
6 has the authority to pick and choose and appoint who they would  
7 like to be on that committee.

8 MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. So for another typical member,  
9 I think we've heard the hundreds of years' experience of this  
10 group of people, the typical background is a senior level person  
11 from these other industries named or it's just in general --

12 MS. LONGORIA: In general.

13 MR. WOODRING: Absolutely. And I worked this up the  
14 other day for the chairman, as a matter of fact. 323 years of  
15 maritime experience, which averages 36 years per person. I have  
16 32 years. I bring the average down. You have three Houston  
17 Pilots, who are obviously full-time mariners. You have myself,  
18 who's spent 28 years in the Coast Guard. Captain Richard Ford,  
19 another retired Coast Guard captain of the port, who then spent  
20 almost 20 years at Saudi Aramco before retiring, and now he's on  
21 the PBIRC. David Foret, you saw him in the video today, licensed  
22 towboat captain, 32 years as a towboat captain, and now runs a  
23 company here in town, very active.

24 You're going to see -- and matter of fact, I think on  
25 your agenda, you're going to meet Paul Caruselle, Rich Russell, a

1 bunch of these people, through your LoneStar Harbor Safety  
2 Committee. It's almost the same group of people, and we move  
3 about from some of these different places, so it's a great cross-  
4 pollination, and we see each other all the time. Tom Marian; Rich  
5 Russell, American Eagle Tankers, he's been around a long time here  
6 in town, and then Paul Caruselle, who I mentioned earlier, has  
7 been SeaRiver.

8 MS. LONGORIA: But the Pilot Board needs to evaluate the  
9 composition of the PBIRC and the ARC on a yearly basis to assure  
10 that the composition is still appropriate.

11 MS. BELL: Can you tell me what the ARC is? I'm sorry.

12 MS. LONGORIA: Application Review Committee.

13 MS. BELL: Okay. I'm sorry.

14 MR. WOODRING: Very similar to the PBIRC, but fulfills  
15 the function --

16 MS. LONGORIA: For the license --

17 MR. WOODRING: -- of reviewing initial licenses -- I'm  
18 sorry -- original commissions. They're licensed by the Coast  
19 Guard and the state of Texas commissions them. So initial ones,  
20 renewals every 4 years, we review their background, their  
21 application, their status, et cetera, before we put that for -- to  
22 the Pilot Commission --

23 MS. LONGORIA: Yes, again --

24 MR. WOODRING: -- as a recommendation. And once they  
25 approve, then we send it on to the state for the governor's

1 signature.

2 MS. BELL: Thank you.

3 MS. LONGORIA: For recommissioning.

4 MR. STOLZENBERG: If I could follow up on that, you said  
5 earlier the -- I don't want to use the term here -- I forget the  
6 exact term used, but the PBIRC looks for human errors related to  
7 the pilots as I understand it. Do they -- do you have another  
8 mission or another goal within that or is that the primary scope  
9 of the PBIRC?

10 MR. WOODRING: Within the scope of what we're looking  
11 at, at the end of the day, we're looking to see if the pilot acted  
12 with prudent seamanship. That would be, I think, what you would  
13 call the disciplinary half of the board. Obviously, the  
14 overarching goal of the NTSB, the Coast Guard, the Pilot Board,  
15 the PBIRC, the Houston Pilots, everybody who uses the waterway is  
16 to make it safer. And that's why the PBIRC will often -- I don't  
17 think that I've ever not had a recommendation of sharing lessons  
18 learned, at a minimum, developing courses, working together, and  
19 we share that information as broadly as possible. So there is a  
20 probable cause piece in what happened, but there's also the goal  
21 of making things safe.

22 MR. STOLZENBERG: So the recs can be two-part, if you  
23 will? One half may be disciplinary in some fashion; another half  
24 would be thinking toward making the waterway safer through  
25 training, or I think what we heard today Brownwater University has

1    been very successful in the Brownwater/Bluewater First Class  
2    University, these types of things, are the secondary set of  
3    recommendations? Am I speaking out of turn or is that correct,  
4    more or less, that there's two types of actions that come out  
5    of a --

6               MR. WOODRING: As you heard today --

7               MS. LONGORIA: It can. That can happen that way.

8               MR. WOODRING: In almost every one, it said recommend no  
9    action, close the file, recommend a letter of caution, whatever.  
10   So that's usually the disciplinary part. And then below that,  
11   you'll almost immediately see and share the lessons learned and  
12   create another training module and create this or get with  
13   LoneStar on that. So almost every time you'll see whatever the  
14   hard, you know, disciplinary thing may be or not disciplinary  
15   thing on the first line followed by recommendations for safety  
16   improvement, and I think they're all listed under proposed  
17   recommendations.

18              MS. LONGORIA: But both pieces --

19              MR. WOODRING: I think that's the name of the  
20   category --

21              MS. LONGORIA: -- I mean, ultimately are for safety of  
22   navigation.

23              MR. STOLZENBERG: On the same line of thinking, does the  
24   Port Commission fund any of the things like Brownwater, the  
25   university, or is there a financial contribution that is -- comes

1 from the Port Commission?

2 MS. LONGORIA: Not to my knowledge. Do we, Marcus?

3 MR. STOLZENBERG: Because I have no idea. Just curious.

4 MR. WOODRING: Brownwater University, we don't, I think,  
5 financially fund it. There is some in-kind time. I'm the --

6 MS. LONGORIA: For training?

7 MR. WOODRING: Personnel time.

8 MS. LONGORIA: Personnel time?

9 MR. WOODRING: People being involved in helping develop  
10 or presenting at the class. We host classes --

11 MS. LONGORIA: Well, see, that would be appropriate  
12 because you're the head of our, you know, safety, and you're the  
13 lead person at the Port of Houston Authority --

14 MR. WOODRING: Yes, ma'am.

15 MS. LONGORIA: -- so of course he would participate.

16 MR. WOODRING: We'll have, you know, design team  
17 meetings here, we'll host them in our rooms or something. I don't  
18 think there's a financial contribution that we've made as the Port  
19 of Houston Authority, but a lot of in-kind. We also have an  
20 appointed seat on the LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee, so again,  
21 that's a lot of staff member time. I just gave that up this past  
22 spring, and Mark Vincent, who is our channel development director,  
23 because they do a lot with the waterway, a lot of safety when it  
24 comes to the dredging and design of the channel, he replaced me as  
25 our representative to LoneStar.

1 MS. LONGORIA: He is also ex-military and very focused.  
2 So he's a good successor to Captain Woodring.

3 MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. If I could follow up with  
4 another question. Mike Morris, when he kicked off today, gave  
5 statistics of the waterway and -- in his presentation to the PBIRC  
6 meeting here today. I'm just -- does the Pilot Commission or the  
7 PBIRC, excuse me, analyze the risk in the waterway? And if so,  
8 how? And --

9 MS. LONGORIA: I don't know what you mean by that. What  
10 do you mean?

11 MR. STOLZENBERG: He gave a presentation number of ship  
12 movements, and then there's very few accidents per those number of  
13 ship movements. Does the PBIRC or the Port Commission analyze  
14 those in any fashion or use that type of data?

15 MS. LONGORIA: Well, we certainly get the information,  
16 and we're all pretty proud of the fact that considering the number  
17 of ship and barge movements I think that the percentage of  
18 accidents is far less than one half of 1 percent; is that right?

19 MR. WOODRING: Yes, ma'am.

20 MS. LONGORIA: It might be two-tenths of --

21 MR. WOODRING: You look at 21,000 movements a year. We  
22 look at about 12 cases in the subcommittee a year, on average.  
23 Let's see. 21,000, so 210 would be 1 percent. 21 would be --

24 MS. LONGORIA: It would be --

25 MR. WOODRING: -- .1 percent. And we're 12.

1 MS. LONGORIA: -- one-tenth of 1 percent.

2 MR. WOODRING: So we're -- I mean, literally, it's --

3 MS. LONGORIA: It's infinitesimal.

4 MR. WOODRING: -- 99.9 something are safe transits.

5 MS. LONGORIA: Yeah. My point being that, to me, that  
6 really is a very good record. And although you've heard of  
7 several in the last few months, considered in total, you know, as  
8 a percentage of the number of transits, it's still a tiny, tiny  
9 percentage.

10 MR. WOODRING: But to answer your question more  
11 specifically, the Coast Guard does what is known as a PAWSA, Port  
12 and Waterway Safety Assessment. I believe the last one was done  
13 2009, 2008 time frame. And it identifies all the risks within the  
14 waterway and what are they. And then it looks at mitigating  
15 factors and brings the scores up or down based on the mitigating  
16 factors and comes out with your top 10 list. There are some  
17 things in Houston that are not -- didn't score well. Visibility.  
18 I mean, can you see that buoy with the refinery behind it? Very  
19 difficult. And that one scored not very well.

20 So those things, when the Coast Guard does that, are  
21 then shared with groups like the LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee  
22 or the old HOGANSAC committee. And it's through collaborative  
23 efforts like that that safety improvements are then driven either  
24 individually or more collegiately toward a solution. So that's  
25 probably the best thing we got. But I also know the chairman has



1 a great safety suggestion for the ship channel, making it -- maybe  
2 modifying the ship channel, making it a little wider to make sure  
3 that we have more safety.

4 MS. LONGORIA: Well, I mean, if you look at this *Conti*  
5 *Peridot/Carla Maersk* as an example, so I don't know -- what were  
6 the beams on those two ships?

7 MR. WOODRING: Probably 130.

8 MS. LONGORIA: I thought it was 150, but okay. So keep  
9 in mind that the channel, the authorized width of the channel is  
10 530 feet. There's silting and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
11 does not -- and the federal government does not provide the  
12 funding necessary to keep the channel at its authorized depth and  
13 width. So if you have two tankers that are traversing the channel  
14 at the same time and the width has been significantly reduced  
15 because of silting and lack of funding from the feds to discharge  
16 their responsibility to keep the channel safely navigable, your  
17 potential for error is magnified. And so I think this really  
18 underscores the importance of the federal government discharging  
19 its responsibility to adequately fund maintenance dredging of our  
20 channel to keep it at its current authorized depth and width and  
21 to provide additional funding, potentially, after we've done a  
22 study, to further widen it and potentially deepen it so that we  
23 don't have so little clearance for large-beam ships that are  
24 coming through our channel at the same time.

25 MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. Thank you. And just to be

1 clear, because I think this is really close to the answer I was  
2 looking for, is you don't produce in-house reports. There's  
3 several other sources of risk analysis that you look at as the  
4 PBIRC or the Port Commission?

5 MS. LONGORIA: Well, does the -- is it the vessel  
6 traffic system that provides the number of transits, and then  
7 we --

8 MR. WOODRING: You have to remember, and this is where I  
9 often -- even as captain of the port, I did not understand this.  
10 We are the Port of Houston Authority. We own or operate eight  
11 terminals out of 150 up and down the Houston Ship Channel. We are  
12 the state entity in town. There are 142 other terminals out there  
13 that are privately owned. So when I go to a conference, people  
14 look at me and say, wow, you're in charge of security at the Port  
15 of Houston? And I say, no, no, no, time out. Port of Houston  
16 Authority. We own and operate 8 of those 150 terminals, all  
17 right? So now we do some things on some days on behalf of  
18 everybody because we're the state entity. We're the federal  
19 sponsor for the dredging on behalf of everybody. We over --

20 MS. LONGORIA: Local sponsor.

21 MR. WOODRING: Local sponsor. We oversee the Houston  
22 Pilots on behalf of everybody. We provide fire boat coverage on  
23 behalf of everybody based on a tariff.

24 MS. LONGORIA: We provide dredge disposal for the  
25 private users that are dredging their facilities.

1           MR. WOODRING: So there are some things that we do on  
2 behalf of everybody and there are some things that we do for  
3 ourselves. So now back to your question.

4           MS. LONGORIA: But can we add one other little layer of  
5 the --

6           MR. WOODRING: Yes, we -- absolutely --

7           MR. STOLZENBERG: Please.

8           MS. LONGORIA: And that is that all of these users have  
9 come together under state law and created the -- what do we call  
10 the safety group?

11          MR. WOODRING: LoneStar?

12          MS. LONGORIA: No, no, the one that Governor Perry  
13 created in 2007? Ship Channel Security District.

14          MR. WOODRING: Oh, right, Security District.

15          MS. LONGORIA: So we all come together to assure that  
16 the channel is as secure as possible, and of course --

17          MR. WOODRING: Right.

18          MS. LONGORIA: -- you know the Coast Guard is in charge  
19 of that primarily. But then you have this additional group that  
20 includes the Port of Houston Authority, Harris County, all of the  
21 city law enforcement structures, and private enterprise, the  
22 ExxonMobils, the Shells, the Kinder Morgans, that also have an  
23 interest in keeping their billion-dollar facilities secure. So  
24 from a safety perspective, we bring people together as the local  
25 sponsor in those kinds of ways.

1           MR. WOODRING: So what was your original question?

2           MR. STOLZENBERG: Well, that's very helpful, because  
3 what I'm being enlightened to is exactly what you do and what  
4 you're responsible for, which I wasn't 100 percent clear on before  
5 I came in here. And so --

6           MR. WOODRING: And I did not even understand it when I  
7 was in the Coast Guard. Until I got here, I did not fully  
8 understand the differentiation between the Port of Houston and the  
9 Port of Houston Authority. We don't have a harbormaster, and so  
10 these committees, such as the Area Maritime Security Committee,  
11 LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee, the Houston Ship Channel  
12 Security District, these committees are fabulous. And there are  
13 Coast Guard reports out there that talk about the collegial nature  
14 of the people in Houston and how far it exceeds a lot of other  
15 places, because we have to work together to keep that environment  
16 and that whole arena out there flowing because we don't have a  
17 harbormaster. It's almost impossible to have one hub about which  
18 it all revolves. Therefore, you have to work together to make the  
19 whole thing work.

20           MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. And so you -- do you produce  
21 any internal reports from the Port Commission or from the PBIRC  
22 regarding accident statistics or analysis, risk analysis, things  
23 of that nature?

24           MS. LONGORIA: Well, we certainly have statistics about  
25 the accidents, the number of transits --

1           MR. STOLZENBERG: Right.

2           MS. LONGORIA: -- because we talk about it in all of our  
3 speeches, and then we know about the number of accidents because  
4 they get brought to the Pilot Board. And I know that Captain  
5 Woodring has put the pencil to paper or done the calculation, as  
6 he did here today, to demonstrate the very small percentage of  
7 accidents as it relates to transits.

8           MR. WOODRING: May not be a study, but I can tell you  
9 after each subcommittee that we have, I will report out to the  
10 LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee, again, as general knowledge,  
11 that we reviewed five cases, two are going to a full hearing, two  
12 were bad communications, and one was a partridge in a pear tree.  
13 Whatever it may be, I report that out for the general good of the  
14 community in that open forum.

15          MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

16          MS. LONGORIA: But also through this collaboration, as  
17 an example, you know, the Houston Pilots have brought to our  
18 attention, the Port Authority, to our attention as the local  
19 sponsor of the federally-owned Houston Ship Channel the need to  
20 smooth out the flare. In other words, there's an S in the ship  
21 channel before you turn in to the Bayport container terminal, and  
22 they're concerned about bringing in larger ships without that  
23 being smoothed out for fear that it could create some safety  
24 issue. So we are working very diligently with Congress and with  
25 the Army Corps of Engineers to try to get them to complete their

1 permitting process to allow us, or in conjunction with them, to  
2 dredge out that S curve going into the Bayport container terminal  
3 so that we can satisfy the Houston Pilots that it's safe to bring  
4 in larger vessels.

5 MR. STOLZENBERG: I think I recall seeing Army Corps  
6 simulation studies on that from 5 years ago --

7 MS. LONGORIA: Yes.

8 MR. STOLZENBERG: -- for larger vessels?

9 MS. LONGORIA: And in fact, you know, just showing  
10 collaboration and working together to assure that we have a safe  
11 and navigable channel, we organized an opportunity for the local  
12 Galveston Army Corps of Engineers representatives, the Dallas  
13 representatives, and the Washington, D.C. representatives to all  
14 come to the Port of Houston Authority on one day, and we took them  
15 out on a boat and we showed them the channel. We took them all  
16 the way out to the flare and the Bayport container terminal so  
17 that they could see firsthand what we're talking about and why  
18 it's so necessary that this be addressed in order to maintain a  
19 safe and navigable channel.

20 MR. STOLZENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Pass.

21 MR. [REDACTED] Yes. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Chairman Longoria, did you ever attend a PBIRC meeting  
23 itself when they actually do the investigation, when they present  
24 that?

25 MS. LONGORIA: I may have attended one or more in the

1 past, but I -- certainly not on any of the recent accidents.

2 MR. [REDACTED] Okay. I know Captain Woodring brought this  
3 up, and we have discussed that, just to make sure we -- on the  
4 record many a time about the Coast Guard's presence on the  
5 hearing. I know we've talked about it previously when you asked  
6 my opinion about the hearing, and I said I didn't think the  
7 questions itself were really as rigorous as they should be to the  
8 pilots. And that is why we in the Coast Guard are trying to get  
9 back onto that board. And we certainly think it would be a  
10 benefit to both of us. And again, our interests are the same with  
11 the safety on there.

12 So with that said, the latest on that is that the -- our  
13 legal department said that if you, meaning either Captain Woodring  
14 or the board itself, sent a letter to the captain of the port  
15 asking for Coast Guard presence on the board, that would kind of  
16 generate some more action.

17 MS. LONGORIA: And could I add something about what I  
18 said -- well, first of all, Captain Woodring, if you wouldn't mind  
19 preparing a letter and then I would be, naturally, signing --

20 MR. WOODRING: For your signature, yes, ma'am.

21 MS. LONGORIA: Because that's an easy fix. But I have  
22 to be very careful about injecting myself into any investigation.  
23 I don't want to become a fact-finder, because my role is to be the  
24 decisionmaker. So it would be like, for example, if you had a  
25 court case and the judge goes out to the scene of the accident to

1 form his or her own opinion about what happened, it's  
2 inappropriate. And I would never want to signal that I'm in the  
3 role of fact-finder, because I'm there as the decisionmaker once  
4 the facts are brought to my attention by the appropriate  
5 investigative body. So I try to be very careful not to signal any  
6 suggestion that I'm doing anything other than following the  
7 appropriate process in making my decision.

8 MR. [REDACTED] I agree with that, and I knew there could  
9 have been an ethical issue with that when I asked the question.  
10 So my follow-up is going to be: Did you ever review a transcript  
11 of the hearing itself if you hadn't attended one? But that was  
12 just specifically to get the flavor of the questions that were  
13 asked.

14 One of the issues --

15 MR. WOODRING: The transcripts are one of the things  
16 that are provided to the Pilot Board in every single case.

17 MR. [REDACTED] Okay.

18 MS. LONGORIA: Upon -- you know, when we're doing our  
19 review of the underlying investigation.

20 MR. WOODRING: Right, as background information. It  
21 doesn't all show up in the book that sits out on the table today,  
22 but there are things that we make sure that the pilot commissioner  
23 has.

24 MS. LONGORIA: The same way a judge could hear testimony  
25 in a court of law in order to form a conclusion about what should



1    happen.

2                   MR. [REDACTED]   And another follow-up question with the  
3   *Elka* just to make the record clear, I was not here as the chief of  
4   investigations when that thing was investigated. I'm doing some  
5   -- unfortunately, like you said, these things have a long tail on  
6   them -- some follow-up on that for the Coast Guard hearing  
7   officer. But there was a federal opinion that came out that was a  
8   limitation of liability and exoneration from liability that the  
9   *Mr. Earl* brought into federal court. I was wondering if anybody  
10   had read that opinion.

11                  MR. WOODRING: No, I have not.

12                  MR. [REDACTED]   All right. That opinion, essentially, from  
13   a federal judge, Lynn Hughes, as a matter of fact, found the pilot  
14   100 percent at fault for that accident. He exonerated the  
15   *Mr. Earl* from the -- from any liability for the action. And I  
16   will gladly -- I thought I sent that to you, to be honest with  
17   you, Captain. I --

18                  MS. LONGORIA: And this was the --

19                  MR. [REDACTED]   This was the *Elka* --

20                  MS. LONGORIA: *Elka*.

21                  MR. [REDACTED]   -- *Apollon* and the *MSC Nederland*, and the  
22   *Mr. Earl* was kind of involved --

23                  MR. WOODRING: I'll see if I have it.

24                  MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

25                  MR. [REDACTED]   -- in the accident. And what I'm getting

1 at is this is the -- and this is not to complain, because we're  
2 trying to work together here, but for this particular case, the  
3 *Elka* there, was the NTSB who found some fault with the pilot. Our  
4 investigation, the Coast Guard's, found fault with the pilot.  
5 Then you had another independent body, the federal judge, also  
6 felt -- found fault with the pilot. And the federal judge went --  
7 I've never read an opinion like that, to be perfectly honest with  
8 you. He actually had some personal things to say against the  
9 pilot. He said he was untruthful. And that was a concern. And I  
10 was -- the question was is maybe you should read that.

11 And this is part of the problem I have when I say --  
12 when I'm at these PBIRC and I see some of the questions that I  
13 don't think really pass a rigorous standard, that should be asked  
14 that aren't asked, and then the conclusions drawn, I don't know  
15 whether or not that they have the validity that they should.  
16 Again, that is to make my case to get somebody -- it won't be me,  
17 unfortunately, but somebody on the board. Because I'll be  
18 investigating some of the accidents, so I can't be on that board  
19 and kind of pile on like that. That would be unethical. I will  
20 gladly send you that --

21 MR. WOODRING: All right. I can look at that --

22 MS. LONGORIA: Just remember, though, that the scope is  
23 constrained for the Pilot Board and the Pilot Board Investigative  
24 Recommendation Committee because of the absence of the other  
25 party. And so we're really relegated to, in some instances -- I

1 mean, in this case, I abated pending your investigation review,  
2 which I believe was going to be more comprehensive, and it was.  
3 But you know, it's just the nature of, you know, not having  
4 subpoena power, not being able to require testimony from the other  
5 party, not being able to get experts from the other party. It's  
6 just a different scope.

7 MR. WOODRING: I'd like to say two things.

8 MR. [REDACTED] Sure.

9 MR. WOODRING: One, we need to act in a timely fashion,  
10 because if there is an issue --

11 MS. LONGORIA: That's true.

12 MR. WOODRING: -- with the pilot, we need to get him off  
13 the water. And so we are also on a faster time schedule, often,  
14 than NTSB or the U.S. Coast Guard, although the U.S. Coast Guard  
15 can pull a license any day they want. I understand that. The  
16 second is, that was my first hearing and I reserve the right to  
17 get smarter. And we've made a lot of changes since that first  
18 hearing. And we are -- we've come a long way, and I reserve the  
19 right to get smarter, and I have.

20 MR. [REDACTED]: Well, mine was just to bring that to the  
21 attention. What I absolutely do not want to do is poison the well  
22 here, because my intent is to work with you and get somebody from  
23 the Coast Guard, somebody from our office that's knowledgeable in  
24 this, on the board. But they're just some of my concerns, and  
25 since we're, like, on an open forum here, I thought I'd voice

1     them.

2                 MR. WOODRING: Right. And it's been a back and forth.  
3     We propose the MOU to you. We've invited you to be on the board.  
4     We've done a lot of things from our side, and we'd love for you to  
5     be involved and our arms are open, [REDACTED] come on across the  
6     table.

7                 [REDACTED]: Listen, I'm doing everything I can.

8                 MR. WOODRING: I know. Okay.

9                 MS. LONGORIA: Well, and we will -- you know, we're  
10    going to examine -- I'm talking about the Pilot Board now -- we're  
11    going to be examining the composition of the Pilot Board  
12    Investigative Recommendation Committee from the standpoint of the  
13    number of pilots that are currently on that investigative and  
14    recommendation committee to determine what the appropriate  
15    composition should be.

16                MR. [REDACTED] I don't have any other questions.

17                MR. JONES: Okay. It's Rob Jones again. I just have a  
18    couple follow-ups. We heard the discussion today, and I think I  
19    might be using the term incorrectly -- a letter of reprimand?  
20    What was the letter?

21                MR. WOODRING: Caution.

22                MS. LONGORIA: Letter of caution.

23                MR. JONES: Letter of caution. I'm sorry. Now, we  
24    heard discussion to try to put that forth, and there was a vote.  
25    But is there anything that -- seeing that it was a concern, do you

1 have any avenue or the PBIRC just to -- and you made the mention  
2 that the NTSB didn't make a recommendation. But it is your  
3 backyard. If you or the PBIRC feel strongly enough about it,  
4 maybe not so much a letter of caution to the pilot, is there just  
5 something you can say, hey, slow down if it's okay and if it's  
6 warranted. I mean, is that something you work just with the  
7 Houston Pilots with and it disseminates down from Captain Morris  
8 to his membership or is that an avenue to pursue?

9 MS. LONGORIA: I think that's likely to happen.

10 MR. JONES: Oh, okay.

11 MS. LONGORIA: I can --

12 MR. WOODRING: Captain Morris and I spoke about it after  
13 the meeting, and he's already putting a note out with the results  
14 of today's --

15 MS. LONGORIA: I can assure you --

16 MR. WOODRING: -- Pilot Commission meeting, but also  
17 noting that there was clear consternation over the speed of the  
18 pilot.

19 MR. JONES: Okay. I mean, yeah, I was just curious, but  
20 that's a very --

21 MS. LONGORIA: Well, I mean, it was listed as an element  
22 of probable cause in the NTSB report. To me, that was the reason  
23 that I thought it was appropriate that the pilot should be  
24 cautioned about that.

25 MR. JONES: Um-hum.

1 MS. LONGORIA: Now, you did point out, and I think I  
2 did, too, that the NTSB did not think it was necessary to do that.  
3 So, you know, at the end of the day, you know, we made the  
4 statement in the meeting, so the pilot and Captain Morris know  
5 that it's something that rose to a level of a very lively  
6 discussion at the table, so I have no doubt that he will take  
7 action within his organization to assure that they're operating  
8 safely.

9 MR. JONES: And with our time down here in Houston,  
10 we've heard a lot of -- I mean, and your explanations today, I  
11 don't know how you keep track of all the entities up and down the  
12 channel, but hats off to you. But --

13 MS. LONGORIA: I give a lot of speeches.

14 MR. JONES: The WGMA meeting we went to yesterday, the  
15 Western Gulf Maritime --

16 MR. WOODRING: West Gulf Maritime Association. They  
17 were hosting the Vessel Traffic Service Town Hall meeting --

18 MR. JONES: Right. And LoneStar, and is there an NAVSAC  
19 committee in the harbor or is that LoneStar?

20 MR. WOODRING: That'd be the LoneStar Harbor Safety  
21 Committee.

22 MR. JONES: Okay.

23 MR. WOODRING: There is an area committee to deal with  
24 oil spills, CTAC, Central Texas Area Coastal --

25 MR. JONES: Okay.

1 MR. WOODRING: And then there's, obviously, the AMSC.

2 MR. JONES: Now, as the chairman of the Port Commission,  
3 do they meet with you on a regular basis or bring area's concern  
4 to you, or is that something you interact, a body you interact  
5 with?

6 MS. LONGORIA: You know, that's delegated to Captain  
7 Woodring --

8 MR. JONES: Okay.

9 MS. LONGORIA: -- and other, you know, staff members in  
10 the Port of Houston Authority, and then they bring it to my  
11 attention or to the attention of the commission if it becomes  
12 necessary --

13 MR. JONES: But their concern -- your body in PBIRC and  
14 yourself, there is an avenue for communication?

15 MS. LONGORIA: There is always an avenue for  
16 communication, and we try to keep abreast of all of those entities  
17 that we've described and what's happening to assure that we're up  
18 to the minute with issues that may be bubbling to the surface.

19 MR. WOODRING: Right.

20 MR. JONES: Okay.

21 MR. WOODRING: And what you saw today was Captain  
22 Morris's quarterly report. Usually about every 3 months, he'll  
23 come and brief the Pilot Commission on what the pilots are doing.  
24 And so that's what today was. It was nothing special or out of  
25 the ordinary. It was the normal quarterly report.

1 MR. JONES: So that was a --

2 MS. LONGORIA: However --

3 MR. JONES: Oh, go ahead.

4 MS. LONGORIA: I think that he wants to clearly  
5 articulate his dedication to safety and to training of the pilots  
6 and would like to communicate that message to the Pilot Board and  
7 to the Commission so that we're comfortable that that is being  
8 discharged.

9 MR. JONES: Well, on a personal level, and I won't speak  
10 for the group, but on a personal level, my interaction with him,  
11 that's very evident from my perspective that he's been that way  
12 since the day I met him.

13 MS. LONGORIA: Yes. Well, he's been that way as long as  
14 he's -- I've only known him in connection with his role as captain  
15 of the Houston Pilots, and I think that occurred -- when did he  
16 come in? In 2013?

17 MR. WOODRING: This is his second stint as presiding  
18 officer. I believe, around --

19 MS. LONGORIA: So it must have been 2012.

20 MR. WOODRING: -- 2004 or '5 --

21 MR. JONES: He was previous, yes.

22 MR. WOODRING: -- he was also kind of (indiscernible).

23 MS. LONGORIA: No, no, I know that. But this stint --

24 MR. WOODRING: Oh, about the same time you've been  
25 chairman, yes, ma'am.



1 MS. LONGORIA: In any event, you know, he's really been  
2 doing a superlative job.

3 MR. JONES: And meetings today about -- with regards to  
4 pilot actions or operations or accidents, that happens monthly if  
5 there's any to bring forward or is it quarterly, your report to  
6 the chairman?

7 MS. LONGORIA: When they're necessary.

8 MR. JONES: Oh, okay.

9 MS. LONGORIA: So could be monthly, could be quarterly.

10 MR. WOODRING: The meetings are monthly.

11 MS. LONGORIA: Monthly.

12 MR. JONES: Right, the Port Commission.

13 MR. WOODRING: And today was very odd because usually  
14 there's four or five actions on commissions --

15 MS. LONGORIA: Correct.

16 MR. WOODRING: -- that need to go to the state and --

17 MS. LONGORIA: It's usually licensing issues where  
18 somebody is --

19 MR. WOODRING: Right. And maybe every --

20 MR. JONES: Right.

21 MS. LONGORIA: -- being recommissioned.

22 MR. WOODRING: Right. Renewal, renewal, renewal. Every  
23 3 or 4 months, you might have one investigation. There were three  
24 on there today, which was --

25 MS. LONGORIA: Very unusual.

1 MR. WOODRING: Which was very unusual and no licenses.

2 MR. JONES: Okay.

3 MR. WOODRING: So today was kind of an odd flip, but  
4 again, they come and go.

5 MR. JONES: Well, and we -- actually, I'm looking at the  
6 pamphlet you provided, and with the diverse group that you're  
7 looking for on the PBIRC, I just noticed that all the votes were 8  
8 to 0. Is that normal? Is that -- do you have a split vote  
9 usually or is it normally 8 to 0?

10 MR. WOODRING: We have nine members. Tom Marian was  
11 missing from the *Summer Wind* case, and Rich Russell was missing  
12 from the other two cases since we had them on the same day. That  
13 reduced us to eight members. We occasionally will have a 8 to 1,  
14 7 to 2. I've never seen anything other than that, and I think we  
15 may have had one of each in the nine that I've held since I've  
16 been chairman. Everything else has been pretty unanimous.

17 MS. LONGORIA: You know, and the reality of it is, and  
18 it's the same way with the commission, if possible, we don't like  
19 to have a split vote, you know, and so we'll reach consensus. You  
20 know, today you saw a split vote on the recommendation in the  
21 *Summer Wind* case, but you know, in general, boards like to try to  
22 come together and figure out the best result unanimously.

23 MR. JONES: Um-hum. I think that concludes mine. I'll  
24 just go around if anybody --

25 MR. [REDACTED] Yeah, one extra thing, and it's toward

1 Captain Woodring. I know I talked to Captain Penoyer about this,  
2 and what he recommended and I agreed is that we, meaning the  
3 investigations department, when we do investigate something and we  
4 find some errors in pilot, tug, or the interaction between the  
5 two, we do a little, like, after-action report and send that to  
6 either you or to you or Captain Morris.

7 MR. WOODRING: Both of us.

8 MR. [REDACTED] And we will leave -- yeah, we --

9 MR. WOODRING: I mean --

10 MR. DAVIES: We can leave the names out or I can put  
11 them in and you could scrub them out. The point is this this  
12 something that we decided we would not take action on because it  
13 was just --

14 MR. WOODRING: Right.

15 MR. [REDACTED] -- too small of an issue, but it was still  
16 an issue.

17 MR. WOODRING: Um-hum.

18 MR. [REDACTED] And if you wanted to bring that up to the  
19 pilot, saying, listen, this is what the Coast Guard found over the  
20 last quarter, some of these things, that might -- if you think  
21 that's a benefit, we can do that. And if not, we won't, because  
22 that's just additional work for us.

23 MR. WOODRING: I assume Captain Penoyer has a  
24 conversation with Captain Morris when these things come up?

25 MR. [REDACTED] You know what? It depends on whether or

1 not I talk to Captain Penoyer since you know how it is with the  
2 transfer season. The last 3 months I've been --

3 MS. LONGORIA: So disappointed.

4 MR. [REDACTED] -- I've been underwater, so --

5 MR. WOODRING: We get him for another year. But when I  
6 was captain of the port, I had some behind-closed-doors talks with  
7 the pilots on certain issues, and I think that's probably a better  
8 thing for the captain of the port to do --

9 MR. [REDACTED] All right. Okay.

10 MR. WOODRING: -- instead of me getting in the middle.

11 MR. [REDACTED] All right.

12 MS. LONGORIA: I think that's right.

13 MR. [REDACTED] Okay.

14 MR. WOODRING: Again, Soriano notwithstanding and not  
15 wanting to mess each other up, but if Captain Penoyer has got  
16 something, I think, between him and Captain Morris is a better  
17 direct avenue to address it. If I have something, I'll certainly  
18 address it with Captain Morris, as well.

19 MR. [REDACTED] All right. Well, that's the way I'll talk  
20 to Captain Penoyer, and that's the way we'll proceed on that.

21 MR. WOODRING: All right. And if he has different  
22 thoughts, let me know. I'm not trying to tell him how to do it,  
23 so --

24 MR. JONES: Carrie?

25 MS. BELL: Yeah. Carrie Bell, NTSB. I just had a

1 couple follow-up questions that -- from some of the questions Eric  
2 was asking. One was on the sort of database of accidents. It  
3 sounds like you don't really have a database of all the accidents  
4 that occur in the Houston Ship Channel, right? There isn't like  
5 a --

6 MS. LONGORIA: Probably not a dedicated -- I mean, we --  
7 I mean, certainly, we have information in our computer system  
8 about it.

9 MS. BELL: Right. So that's my follow-up question of --

10 MR. WOODRING: The Coast Guard will.

11 MS. BELL: They will have that --

12 MR. WOODRING: They must get a report, a 2692, an  
13 accident report any time there's a reportable maritime casualty.  
14 And they do a year-end review that we'll see the statistics from.  
15 The Vessel Traffic Service will show where all the hot spots are,  
16 where all the X's are. They can tell you how many allisions,  
17 collisions, groundings, fuel filter problems there were. I mean,  
18 they can break it down, and all that resides with the U.S. Coast  
19 Guard as their overarching role.

20 MS. BELL: Okay.

21 MS. LONGORIA: Does that include if they run into our  
22 dock?

23 MR. WOODRING: Yes, ma'am. That'll be --

24 MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

25 MR. WOODRING: -- listed as an allision.

1 MS. LONGORIA: Thank you.

2 MS. BELL: So --

3 MR. [REDACTED] That's headquarters, though. It's a  
4 headquarters --

5 MR. WOODRING: We can probably tell you how many ran  
6 into our docks, but if you want to know how many ran into all the  
7 docks, then you need to talk to the Coast Guard.

8 MS. LONGORIA: Okay.

9 MS. BELL: Okay. But you have access to that  
10 information only from their reports?

11 MR. WOODRING: They sometimes do it quarterly at the --  
12 again, at these meetings, safety meetings. If we needed that  
13 information, I'm sure we could call and talk to them about it, and  
14 I'm sure that they would give us a sanitized version, maybe  
15 without names of all the ships, but there were 12 groundings or  
16 something. That's not classified information or protected, I  
17 wouldn't think.

18 MS. BELL: Okay. So you would be able -- you might be  
19 able to gather that --

20 MS. LONGORIA: You would have access to it more easily  
21 than we would.

22 MS. BELL: Oh, okay.

23 MS. LONGORIA: Because you're a federal agency and  
24 you're an investigative agency.

25 MR. WOODRING: Right.

1 MS. LONGORIA: If you ask the Coast Guard for that,  
2 they're going to give it to you.

3 MR. WOODRING: If you wanted details. For example --

4 MS. BELL: So --

5 MR. WOODRING: -- I'm on their distribution list, and  
6 when -- this morning I got a little email, ding, oh, look, the  
7 ship channel's closed, there's an oil spill. Okay. I mean, so I  
8 get the VTS notes that come out of there that talk about the ship  
9 channel is closed or this or that. So I get some of that  
10 information. Do I track it? No.

11 MS. BELL: Okay. So that's kind of what I'm getting at,  
12 is if you had a way to track that to look at and maybe identify  
13 trends, it was because -- you know, these accidents happen during  
14 fog, during --

15 MR. WOODRING: Right.

16 MS. LONGORIA: But see, we don't do that because that's  
17 the Coast Guard's responsibility.

18 MS. BELL: But just to know what's happening here when  
19 there's fog, we've had this many accidents.

20 MR. WOODRING: Right.

21 MS. BELL: Or, you know, maybe they might be due to  
22 communications or fatigue or some factor that might be a trend  
23 that's occurring in the waterway. That's sort of what I was  
24 getting at was if --

25 MR. WOODRING: And that's one of the reasons when we go

1 to the LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee after a subcommittee  
2 meeting, I say we looked at five cases, these were the issues.  
3 And they're sanitized, but again, it's a trend kind of setting.  
4 We're seeing more communications issues, we're seeing more of  
5 this, we're seeing more of that.

6 MS. BELL: Okay. So it goes to the --

7 MR. WOODRING: And the year-end review by the Coast  
8 Guard compares it to last year. So you can see that collisions  
9 went up, allisions went down, groundings were over here.

10 MS. LONGORIA: I just think the Coast Guard would have  
11 the biggest repository of comprehensive information with that kind  
12 of tracking because that's what they do.

13 MR. WOODRING: Right, so --

14 MS. LONGORIA: Especially with that Vessel Traffic  
15 system.

16 MR. WOODRING: Right. Pilots must report to us when  
17 they have an accident. If you're not a pilot, I don't get that  
18 word. So the Coast Guard --

19 MS. LONGORIA: They'll have a much larger repository of  
20 information.

21 MR. WOODRING: I'm not sure what, I'm not sure what  
22 constant access to that database would help us with.

23 MS. BELL: No, not necessarily.

24 MR. WOODRING: But I like the quarterly or I like the  
25 annual, and I keep it every year. I've probably got 5 years'



1   worth of the VTS year-end review, with the trends going up and  
2   down. Matter of fact, Hurricane Ike just fell off the end of  
3   it --

4               MS. LONGORIA: Oh.

5               MR. WOODRING: -- which changed some of the dynamics on  
6   their trend lines. Which was interesting, but --

7               MS. LONGORIA: That's interesting.

8               MS. BELL: Okay. And the only other question I had was  
9   we were talking about the PBIRC and how it is -- you know, what it  
10   consists of, but you mentioned early on about a subcommittee. So  
11   the subcommittee, you said, consisted of five people.

12              MS. LONGORIA: Five of (indiscernible).

13              MS. BELL: How is that group appointed or how are they  
14   different from the -- are they the same for a year or 2 years or  
15   how does that work?

16              MS. LONGORIA: You do that internally at the PBIRC?

17              MR. WOODRING: We do that internally, and it's the  
18   chairman, the presiding officer of the Houston Pilots are two that  
19   are always there. Paul Caruselle has been there forever. He's  
20   the 20-year member of the PBIRC. And then Rich Russell is fairly  
21   new on it. He just came to his first one earlier this year.

22              MS. LONGORIA: He's maritime industry.

23              MR. WOODRING: Yes, ma'am.

24              MS. LONGORIA: Um-hum.

25              UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: AET --

1           MR. WOODRING: And David Foret is the other one. So we  
2 have a brown water, a blue water, a pilot, and a Houston -- we  
3 kind of split it up. I don't think there's any -- there's no  
4 formal process that goes to the Pilot Commission for selecting the  
5 subcommittee. It probably could be the full PBIRC to sit down and  
6 look at these cases to determine whether they warrant a full  
7 hearing or not. And it's a very -- quite honestly, it's not a  
8 long discussion. You have materials and you look at it, and we  
9 err on the side of having a full hearing. So unless the rudder  
10 fell off, it's probably going to a full hearing. Unless it's very  
11 clearly a mechanical problem that had no pilot opportunity to  
12 prevent. And so it's -- we can go through five or six cases in an  
13 hour, hour and a half. And again, we're not determining fault.  
14 We're not determining anything. We're just determining whether  
15 there is enough to go this next step.

16           MS. BELL: So they're kind of a first look --

17           MR. WOODRING: So it could be the full committee; we've  
18 narrowed it down to five for ease of scheduling.

19           MS. BELL: I think that's all I've got.

20           MR. STOLZENBERG: I have one last follow-on question.  
21 Regarding these Board of Pilot Commissioner matters that we heard  
22 today, the recommendations -- and I might be testing someone's  
23 memory, but are there ever recommendations that go beyond the  
24 Pilots Association? In other words, I'm looking -- part of the  
25 time here over the couple days is to see where the safety ideas

1 are generated in different areas of the port, and I don't know  
2 where that is. Is it -- do these ever say -- do they ever go  
3 beyond the pilots or brown water or blue water? Do they go  
4 outside of the realm of the pilots, some of these recommendations,  
5 if your memory serves?

6 MS. LONGORIA: I don't -- how could it, though, if  
7 you're -- I mean, since it's relating to the activities of the  
8 pilots and --

9 MR. WOODRING: Yeah, I don't recall any going out  
10 outside of the --

11 MR. STOLZENBERG: I'm just asking --

12 MS. LONGORIA: Yeah.

13 MR. WOODRING: -- Houston area. They might go to  
14 Brownwater University. They might go to the LoneStar Harbor  
15 Safety Committee, but it's probably going to be to the pilot to  
16 work with the LoneStar Harbor Safety Committee to develop this  
17 module --

18 MS. LONGORIA: Oh, I see. You were asking whether it  
19 goes outside their organization?

20 MR. STOLZENBERG: Right. Does it ever --

21 MR. WOODRING: Right.

22 MR. STOLZENBERG: Has one of these ever gone to VTS or  
23 to ExxonMobil's terminal --

24 MS. LONGORIA: Ah, I see. I see what you're saying.

25 MR. STOLZENBERG: -- or to the Coast Guard?

1 MS. LONGORIA: I see what you're saying.

2 MR. STOLZENBERG: Has there been any other finding? I  
3 realize the scope is to the pilots --

4 MR. WOODRING: Yeah, we had --

5 MR. STOLZENBERG: -- but is there --

6 MR. WOODRING: Look at the last one, the *Gaschem Hunte*,  
7 I think there was something about the VTS in there, where we were  
8 going to try to resolve something with them. I'm not sure it went  
9 to a full recommendation, but it's contained in there.

10 MR. STOLZENBERG: Yeah, the VTS --

11 MS. LONGORIA: There you go.

12 MR. STOLZENBERG: That's correct. PBIRC will review  
13 this case with the Coast Guard VTS.

14 MS. LONGORIA: Um-hum.

15 MR. STOLZENBERG: So there are some, okay. And to  
16 follow on that, are these available? Can we get a certain number  
17 of these, historically?

18 MR. WOODRING: Absolutely. I will take you to the Pilot  
19 Board website, and there's minutes of every subcommittee meeting  
20 and every meeting we've ever had going back as far as I've been  
21 chairman.

22 MR. STOLZENBERG: Thank you very much.

23 MR. WOODRING: Yes, sir. Website. Got it.

24 MR. JONES: Any other questions?

25 MR. [REDACTED] None from me.

1 MR. JONES: Any --

2 MS. LONGORIA: Can I just say that --

3 MR. JONES: Sure.

4 MS. LONGORIA: -- just sort of as a final statement,  
5 that I think you were able to observe today, and after  
6 interviewing Captain Woodring and myself that we take our  
7 responsibility really, really seriously. And it's very important  
8 to me as a fiduciary to discharge my responsibility effectively  
9 and to come up with the appropriate decision in every unique case.  
10 I really depend on the delegated authority to experts like Marcus  
11 and the other maritime experts that are on the PBIRC, but I always  
12 reserve judgment until I hear everything at the hearing and get  
13 the information, for example, that I got from the NTSB before  
14 making a final decision. And we do the best we can to discharge  
15 that responsibility.

16 MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. WOODRING: Thank you.

18 MR. LONGORIA: Thank you.

19 MR. [REDACTED] Thank you.

20 MS. BELL: Thank you.

21 MR. JONES: All right. That concludes the interview.

22 (Whereupon, the interview was concluded.)  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:           M/V *CONTI PERIDOT* COLLISION WITH  
                                  THE M/T *CARLA MAERSK* IN THE  
                                  HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL  
                                  MARCH 9, 2015  
                                  Interview of Janiece Longoria and  
                                  Marcus Woodring

DOCKET NUMBER:           DCA-15-MM-017

PLACE:

DATE:                       July 28, 2015

was held according to the record, and that this is the original,  
complete, true and accurate transcript which has been transcribed  
to the best of my skill and ability.

---

Danielle S. VanRiper  
Transcriber