## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

+ + + + +

TRANSPORTATION WORKER IDENTIFICATION CREDENTIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 7, 2006

+ + + + +

RENAISSANCE LONG BEACH HOTEL
111 EAST OCEAN BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

#### **APPEARANCES**

### FACILITATOR:

CAPTAIN JIM BAMBERGER
Branch Chief of Maritime
Passenger Security
Transportation Security Administration

### PANEL:

LUKE HARDEN
Project Manager
Consolidation of Merchant Mariner
Qualification Credentials
Office of Operating and Environmental
Standards
Coast Guard Headquarters
Division of Maritime Personnel

COMMANDER PETE GAUTIER
Chief of Cargo and Facilities Division
Coast Guard Headquarters
Washington, D.C.

CAPTAIN FRANK STURM
Chief of Office of Port and
Facility Activities
Coast Guard Headquarters

JOHN SCHWARTZ
Project Manger
Transportation Worker Identification
Credential
Transportation Security Administration

STEPHEN J. RYBICKI General Manager, Maritime Security U.S. Department of Homeland Security

# **AGENDA**

OVERVIEW:	TITLE 49
	JOHN SCHWARTZ 15
	COMMENTS
LUNCH BREAK	
OVERVIEW:	TITLE 33
	LUKE HARDEN 90
	COMMENTS
BREAK:	
OVERVIEW:	TITLE 46
	LUKE HARDEN 166
	COMMENTS
TITLES 49, 33, 46:	FURTHER COMMENTS
CLOSING	STEPHEN RYRICKT 214

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 || (10:00 A.M.)

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. I would like to welcome everybody here today and just start off by saying -- speaking for the Panel -- we really appreciate the distance and the time that everybody has taken off from this busy time of year to get here today. If anybody hasn't done so and can do so quietly because we're going to get going, because we're going to get going, there's a lunch drop off box at the sign in table. There will be box lunches available today between 12:00 and 1:00; and if you haven't done so and you have the desire, there's a drop off box for your lunch orders where you signed in.

My name is Jim Bamberger. I'm the Branch Chief of Maritime Passenger Security for the Transportation Security Administration, and I will be the Facilitator here today. First off, I would just like to say that we are very grateful for your participation; and once again, thank you for your time

and commitment this important process.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

Our focus today -- can everybody hear me in the back? Our focus today is on two Notices of Proposed Rulemakings. First, the Transportation Worker Identification Credential or TWIC. And second, the consolidation of Merchant Mariner Qualification These Public Meetings will assist the Credentials. TSA and the Coast Guard in our effort to gain insight, information and become better informed as decisions are made for the final rulemaking. Today's meeting will be recorded, and the transcript will be submitted to both Coast Guard and TSA dockets for these rulemakings. We also encourage you to submit your own comments to the docket if you have not already done so.

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. Let's take a few moments just to review housekeeping and logistics, and then I will provide you with an overview of today's schedule and how we proceed. First of, if you have ordered a box lunch -- and lunch is usually foremost on everybody's

mind -- at least until we get started -- you can pick up those lunches in the lobby bar and use cash or a credit card. Should we need to evacuate this room, proceed through the doors behind you and to the right, and you will see stairs. Right directly behind and to the right, there are stairs to the first floor. The rest rooms are directly out the side right door and to your left.

Okay. We're going to -- the way we're going to work this is we are going to have a presentation on each one of these Titles and then an hour and 15 minute comment period after those. We are really going to make an effort, judging by the size of the group today, to keep those comments to four minutes. If we don't hear all those comments for that Title in that hour and 15-minute period, we will go on to the next Title; but we will have time at the end of the day for any comments to be heard on any one of the three. So, if we cut it off after an hour and 15 and you're still standing in line and you haven't had your comments heard, at the end of the day, we will open

the floor to comments on any one of those three issues.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

If I could first ask everyone to put their cell phones and/or blackberries to silent, we would really appreciate that. Okay. I would like to announce a few Coast Guard attendees who will not be on the Panel, but are attending this presentation to observe and listen and hear your comments as well. Captain Gough, Chief of Prevention for PAC Area is here today. Captain Swanson, Chief of Prevention, District 11, Captain Wheatenoff, Commanding Officer, Sector Los Angeles and Long Beach, Captain Uverdie, Commanding Officer, Sector San Francisco Bay. Captain Mark Gillary, Captain of the Port of Juneau, Commander Jason Merriweather, representing Commanding Officer Sector San Diego. Thank you for being here. I am sure you know these folks on this coast, and those gentlemen will be here to observe and hear your comments and be part of the listening session.

22

Okay. If we could go to Slide 2. This will give you information to the website, how to submit comments to the docket and this entire Power Point Presentation that you will see today is available on this website. So should anybody desire a copy of this slideshow, you can get that from that website as well. So I will just leave that up there for a minute for anybody who wants to copy this information down.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Okay. Slide 3. Today's meeting covers two significant rulemakings, which would amend three titles. Title 49, which determines the standard for the TWIC Security Threat Assessment Enrollment, Appeals and Waiver Procedures. Title 33, which would amend Coast Security Plan Requirements Under Sub-Chapter H, such as access control measures and other requirements for owners and operators and Title 46, which proposes to consolidate Merchant Mariner Credentials. This is a lot of information to cover in this one meeting; so like I said, we focused our agenda and tried to keep the comment periods for an

hour and 15 minutes to each Title, but should we have happen what we had happened yesterday in St. Louis, we will certainly have time afterwards if we stick to the four-minute comment period to hear any and all comments covering any one of these three titles at the end of today's session.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

For each of these Titles, one of our Panel experts will give a brief overview of proposed changes. Following each overview, we will open the floor to comments for approximately one hour and 15 minutes. We will begin with an overview of the TWIC Program and changes to Title 49, followed by Title 33 and then 46. And as I said, at the end of the day we will open the floor to any comment related to any of the above Titles. Each commenter will have four minutes to comment. When you comment, what we'd like to have you do is queue up down the side of this wall. There is a wire for the microphone; so, please be careful of that. And when you first come up to the microphone, please state your name and association before you give your comment. Then when you're

finished with your comment, please drop any written
comments you have towards the docket in one of these
three boxes, each titled for each rulemaking, each
Title. And also, there's a white dish on the table
next to the court reporter for your business card.
And then if you would just file down the center, that
would great. While you are speaking, we allow four
minutes for each comment. When we get to 30 seconds
left or three and a half minutes, I will hold up a
yellow card and that will let you know I'll put it
right here and that will let you know you have 30
seconds left. When you get to the end of the four
minutes, I will hold up a red card, and that will mean
that your four minutes are up and we'd appreciate it
if you could wrap up at that point. If I have to step
in, I'll just say you know, I have to cut you off
because we have a large line of people. If there is
nobody left, you know, we can work with that. But we
are really trying to keep it to that because I know we
have a lot of people here who would like to have their
comments heard, and we want to make sure that we can
get through everybody.

We're going to take a lunch break from 12:00 to 1:00 o'clock, for an hour, and we will take a energy break, if you will, at 2:30 for about 10 minutes, and we'll announce those.

Okay. Can we go to Slide 4? Now I'd like to introduce the Panel of TSA and Coast Guard Experts, and then I'll turn the meeting over to them. For the overviews of their position and what they will be speaking on today, I'd like to start with Mr. Luke Harden.

LUKE HARDEN: Good morning. My name is
Luke Harden. I'm the Project Officer on Consolidation
of Merchant Mariner Qualification Credentials. I am
assigned to the Office of Operating and Environmental
Standards at Coast Guard Headquarters, Division of
Maritime Personnel Qualifications. I've been an
employee of the United States Coast Guard for 22 years
and have been involved with the Commercial Vessel
Safety Program since 1988. During that time, I have

been the Chief of the Inspection Department, Chief of Licensing Departments and Senior Investigating Officer. I have been writing Licensing Regulations During that time, I have worked on since 1999. Licensing Rules for Towing Vessel Operators, SPCW, as well working on U.S. Delegations the International Maritime Organizations and the International Labor Organizations. My comments on the Combined Credentials will be made this afternoon. Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

COMMANDER PETE GAUTIER: Good morning, my name is Commander Pete Gautier, and I am the Chief of the Cargo and Facilities Division at Coast Guard Headquarters in Washington. have 19 years experience in the Coast Guard Marine Safety World, and my prior tours include four years as Chief of Port Operations and Environmental Response at Marine Safety Office, San Francisco Bay. I have prior experience working at Headquarters in the Administration and Writing Regulatory 49 C.F.R.; and also, internationally, with International Maritime the

Organization and the IMDG Code. Some of you may know Commander Cindy Stowe. She held this position until two weeks ago. She has recently been transferred and now works at the White House on the Homeland Security Council. So I recently replaced Cindy. Thank you very much.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

CAPTAIN FRANK STURM: Good morning. am Captain Frank Sturm, Chief of Office of Port and Facility Activities, Coast Guard Headquarters. We are -- our office is responsible for most of the Coast Guard policies and standard development for pretty much anything safety, security, environmental protection-wise related to ports, facilities I've been in the Coast Guard 27 years, and cargo. most of that time has been in Marine Safety Field, a variety of jobs in Coast Guard Field Offices, as well as my third go-round in Coast Guard Headquarters now. We are very eager to hear your comments, and I just want to state up front that we are also interested in getting your written comments and that your verbal comments don't carry any more -- will not

carry any more -- weight than the written comments. So if you feel you have more to say but have run out of time, please put them in writing because they are given just as much consideration as anything you say here. If you have people -- friends, colleagues, coworkers, others -- back in your work place who were not able to travel, please encourage them to send in their written comments to the docket because, again, those carry just as much weight with us as any verbal comments. Thank you.

JOHN SCHWARTZ: Good morning, my name is John Schwartz. I'm with the Transportation Security Administration, and I am the Transportation Worker Identification Credential Project Manger. I joined TSA in January of 2003 and have been associated with the TWIC Program since I joined TSA. Before coming to TSA, I served 29 years in the United States Coast Guard, retiring as Chief of Staff of the Coast Guard's Mid-Atlantic Region. During my 29 years in the Coast Guard, I served as Commanding Officer of Coast Guard Cutters, as well as a number of tours at

1	Coast Guard Headquarters one of them involving a
2	Project Manager for a major ship acquisition. After
3	I retired from the Coast Guard and before joining TSA,
4	I was in private industry. I was a Project Manager
5	leading a team of Engineering and Logistics
6	professionals in supporting a number of Government
7	contracts. I look forward to
8	hearing your comments today on our proposed Rule.
9	Thank you very much.
10	
11	STEVE RYBICKI: Good morning. I'm
12	Steve Rybicki. I'm the General Manager for Maritime
13	Security with TSA. I've got over 25 years of
14	experience in the Maritime industry. I will be
15	listening to Mr. Harden this afternoon, as I am up for
16	renewal of my active Coast Guard License in September,
17	and this will, in fact, be directly.
18	
19	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Steve.
20	Before I turn the mic over, I would like to also let
21	you know that we have in our audience a group of TSA
22	and Coast Guard Attorneys, Economists and Subject

Matter Experts from the TWIC Rulemaking Team, and they're here to hear your comments as well. I would now like to turn the mic over to John Schwartz to provide an overview of the TWIC Program and the changes to Title 49. When he is finished, we will open the floor to any related comment on that Title.

## TITLE 49: OVERVIEW

## JOHN SCHWARTZ

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Thanks very much Jim. And good morning I'm going to give you an overview of the once again. TWIC Program, as it stands, and as we have proposed. First of all, the TWIC itself, for those of you who have not seen it, it's a Biometric Identification Credential that will be issued by TSA. The TWIC Program encompasses a number of activities. summarized in saying we will involve workers and then background checks; conduct and upon successful completion of those background checks, TSA will issue I want to emphasize that a card to those workers. while this is a TSA responsibility to issue the cards and conduct the enrollments, it will actually be

conducted by a contractor who will be selected in a competitive process with a contract awarded on the best value to the government. This contractor, among many other duties, will provide trusted agents -- those are the people that will be actually conducting the enrollments of workers for the TWIC Cards -- that will have to meet a number of stringent criteria to perform that function. As I mentioned, the issuance of the card will be based on the security threat assessment that will be conducted by TSA, and it must be satisfactorily completed before the card can be issued.

The TWIC initially is going to be required for individuals who need unescorted access to secure areas of MTSA-regulated facilities. Those facilities include the approximately 3,500 port and maritime facilities that are shore based, as well as over 10,000 vessels and a number of outer-continental shelf structures. We also are including in our proposed Rule the approximately 200,000 Credentialed Merchant Mariners as required by TWIC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

The TWIC is designed to be a multimodal Credential. It could be used for workers in any transportation mode as a secure form of identification The Department is and also as an access control tool. considering follow-on rulemakings for additional modes outside of the Maritime mode; but this Rule concerns itself only with the Maritime Industry and workers in that industry. For the successful conclusion to the rulemaking endeavors, we hope to begin enrollments by the end of this calendar year. Once we do begin enrollments, we project approximately a year and a half to complete the initial enrollment of all workers that will be required to have a TWIC. Enrollment Centers will be located at sites throughout the country.

17

18

19

20

21

22

This diagram shows you the TWIC process, and I'll run through it quickly, but then describe in a little more detail each element of these processes as we proceed in the briefing. First of all, transportation workers will come to an enrollment

site the ones that I mentioned run by a contractor
where they will complete the enrollment process.
Once the enrollment process is complete, the record
will be sent electronically to our TSA System, which
will conduct the background check and a number of
other functions that will result ultimately in the
receipt of the card by the individual. Once the
background check and vetting is complete, we've done
our other matches and things that we need to do, we
will send an order for the card to be produced at a
centralized card production facility run by the
Federal Government. That card facility will then
shift the card back to the Enrollment Center where the
person enrolled. Upon receipt, the worker will be
notified to come back to the Enrollment Center and
pick up the completed card. They will go through a
process there and be issued the card. At this point,
the worker will have the Credential; but what the
worker will not have is privileges at any of the MTSA-
regulated facilities. In order to do that, he will
have to take the card to a MTSA-regulated facility
whereby he will prove that the card is his through the

matching of the biometric. The Facility Operator will be responsible for conducting a quick check that the card remains valid; and at that point, he can be granted access -- either a permanent type of access or a one-time visit access. The access part of -- let me state at this point -- TSA and our Rule concerns primarily this part up through the card issuance. The Coast Guard's Rule concerns primarily the interaction between the worker and the facility as far as the rules and regulations for access are concerned.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The enrollment process can begin with what we call pre-enrollment. This is an optional function that's available to the worker, can be conducted over the internet, and is a recommended thing to do. The reason we recommend this is it gives time to enter certain personal worker the It can be entered by computer -- his information. name, address, name of employer, etc. importantly, it will also afford the worker opportunity schedule an appointment to at an Enrollment Center. It will advise him as to where the

nearest Enrollment Centers are to that worker's location and will expedite the enrollment process once he gets to the Enrollment Center. At the Enrollment Center -- as I mentioned -- we will have them located throughout the country -- I can't tell you exactly where they will be at this point; but I can tell you that we have a list of 125 general port locations where we will insure that there are Enrollment Centers at least in those port locations and certain outreach functions. One of the reasons I can't tell you today where exactly those Centers will be located is because it's going to be up to the contractor, the winning contractor, for this Program to recommend to us his strategy for reaching all of the people that require a TWIC in accordance with the criteria that we will provide.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Once at the Enrollment Center, the applicant is going to provide their biographic information, I just mentioned, biometric that information; that is, we are going to take an image -a scanned image -- of their fingerprints, their ten prints; and they will also present identity documents, which we will scan into the system and retain as a record of their enrollment.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

Once we've completed the enrollment process, as I mentioned, then we will conduct the security threat assessment. This will be conducted completely by TSA based on information that we receive from all the other Agencies and checks that we will be conducting. At the conclusion of this threat assessment, the applicant will be either notified that the Credential is ready for pick up; or he will be notified that it appears as though there may be a reason to disqualify him for eligibility for a TWIC. In that case, he will be advised of both his appeal rights and his waiver rights, which I will go through in a moment. As I mentioned then, once the Credential is produced, the applicant picks up the Credential at the Enrollment Center, and it's ready for use at MTSAregulated facilities.

21

20

22 || I have already mentioned TSA's

responsibilities that are outlined here, once again, and the Coast Guard's responsibilities for enforcing the Rule and determining the requirements for the Facility Operators.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

4

1

2

3

So who must get a TWIC? Well, the technical answer in the Rule is that all individuals who require unescorted access to what are defined as secured areas of MTSA-regulated vessels, facilities, and OCS that's the outer-continental shelf facilities, will require a TWIC. However, this is not limited to just people in the following types of occupations -- longshoremen, truck drivers, various vendors that service these facilities. It's not a job category card. It's a card that the determination of who will require it will be of the nature of the job and whether they need to do their job inside a secured area. Once again, also, regardless of their location, all U.S. Coast Guard Credential Merchant Mariners will require a TWIC.

21

22 || As Jim mentioned earlier, the CFR's

that we're going to amend or are proposing to amend include those listed here. The first one is the Hazardous Material Endorsement Regulation for truck drivers who currently require a hazmat Endorsement on their driver's license, and TSA already has a program that provides screening and enrollment for those people. And then there are the two Maritime Security Regulations listed.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

TSA's changes to CFR 49 includes the requirement for the security threat assessment, the requirement to obtain the data that I mentioned at enrollments, the requirement for owners and operators also to use equipment such as biometric readers that conform to a federal standard. The federal standard is this FIPS 201. That acronym stands for the Federal Information Processing Standard that is issued by the through Department of Commerce their National Institute of Science and Technology.

20

21

22

Applicants disqualified due to previous criminal activity or mental incapacity may get a

waiver showing mitigating factors, and that's one of the other inclusions in CFR 41.

The estimated impact economically of the proposed Rule is shown on this slide. Obviously, in the first year, with all the start-up costs, facility costs and enrollment costs for the workers — that will be the largest cost of the proposed 10-year coverage by this chart. You might also notice that in year 6, there is an additional estimation that there will be increased costs for technology refreshments, plus workers that are coming back in to renew their cards since this is proposed to be a five-year card.

The second chart or graphic indicates the government's estimate for the specific costs to the various MTSA-regulated facilities. These specific costs are shown here, averaging out -- the average cost estimation for a facility -- although it's a very, very wide range going from very, very small facilities to extremely large complexes -- the average works out to be about \$100,000. And for vessels in

the outer-continental shelf facilities, it works out to be about \$10,000 each. But once again, that's a very wide range depending on the sophistication of the requirements.

We estimate that the population of workers that will require a TWIC card is approximately 750,000 at any one point in time. Once again, this is only workers at MTSA-regulated facilities. And we came up with this estimate based on a number of surveys, as well as interviews with subject matter experts. The survey was performed by both TSA and the Coast Guard.

The estimated TWIC fees fall in the range -- and once again -- this is a range, which was mentioned in the Rule -- the top range of 149 -- this is the median of the range. But a standard TWIC Card for most workers who have not had previous qualifying background check will be in the range of \$139. Those who have had a comparable background check completed within the appropriate period, we can avoid the costs

of running another background check and simply the enrollment process, which is different for any of the other background checks that they may have received, as well as the costs of producing a card. So this is a \$105 cost for those individuals. Lost and damaged cards, \$36.00. The fees cover -- by law -- the fees collected must fully cover the cost of the Program. So that's how we arrive at these costs.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

This pie chart shows a breakdown of how we arrive at the costs. The most significant cost, of whenever involving people course, you're and activities where there's a one-on-one relationship, and that's the enrollment and issuance processes right here, is the largest cost driver. Everything else is pretty much done through technology. assessment cost includes both the pass through cost that the TSA has to pay to conduct certain of the background checks, as well as the cost to review and adjudicate any waivers that might be required.

21

22

Next slide. If you'll follow me in

reverse order on this slide, I'd like to start at the bottom instead of the top. These are the security threat assessments that TSA will be conducting. First of all, an intelligence or terrorism check of our various data bases that we have, throughout the government, that is. The next check is the legal status of the individuals. An individual -- to get a TWIC Card must either be a U.S. Citizen or must qualify as a lawful resident or someone possessing a right to work in that particular case here in the United States. So a legal presence check will be And then, finally, the criminal history conducted. records check required by the MTSA law will be conducted based on fingerprints, and there permanent and interim disqualifiers. And the reason I went in reverse order is so we can move into what those disqualifiers are.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

The permanent disqualifying offenses are those criminal offenses that if one is convicted of committing one of those offenses, that we could look back at an unlimited period as to when that

offense was -- when they were convicted -- and that would be then permanently disqualifying. They are listed here. I am not going to list them. And they are listed in the MPR. Hopefully, you all had a chance to pick up a copy.

The next slide are what we call interim disqualifying criminal offenses. These are for convictions within seven years or an offense for which someone has been released from incarceration within five years of his or her application for a TWIC card. It does include warrants associated with those crimes. Now these crimes can be -- these are the crimes that one can make a waiver request on if there has been a conviction within or release from incarceration in the periods stated.

So that's pretty much the TWIC Program as we see it and as we have proposed. Once again, we will be inviting comments on this portion of the Rule at this point. I'm going to turn it over to Jim. I will say -- also reiterate that we are primarily in a

listening made. If we can comment on observations of a general nature or clarify something, we will do that; but other than that, we will be primarily listening to your comments. Thank you very much.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Please announce your name and your affiliation and then give you comment. If you have a business card, please drop it right here at the court reporter's table. If you have written comments, there is box right next to the table for those written comments and then just exit down the center lane, and we will keep the flow working that way. Okay. The floor is yours.

# COMMENTS

MARC MacDoNALD: Good morning. I'm Marc MacDonald, Vice President of the Accident Prevention Department for Pacific Marine Maritime Association. Our Association represents stevedores, terminal operators and shipping companies operating in California, Washington and Oregon that handle essentially all of the maritime container break vault,

dry vault cargo moving in and out of the West Coast ports. Thank you for holding these hearings and allowing us an opportunity to make our comments and ask questions regarding the proposed Regulations. am here with a number of PMA members and companies today to offer comments. Since the very inception of the concept of the TWIC, PMA and its members have been engaged and supportive. In particular, four of our major terminal operators engaged in the TSA prototype testing of the TWIC in 2004. In addition, we have posted members of the Coast Guard and TSA to enable them to understand the scope of our operations and the criticality of the technology and rapid TWIC verification to through port of the terminals.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

We were very surprised and dismayed to discover that the standards for hardware and access control for the processes discussed and tested and envisioned during the prototype phase have been completely changed in the Proposed Rules. What really hit home was that the FIPS 201 Standards were being developed by MIST in the Department of Commerce at the

same time that we were conducting the prototype test with TSA at our terminals. We feel that MIST should probably be on the stage as a participant to explain some of the nuances associated with the FIPS. We understand why the government developed this FIPS 201 standard. What we do not understand is why the Maritime Industry needs the level of security that has been developed for a DOD Facility.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

What is equally troubling is that no DOD Facility, nor any Coast Guard or TSA Facility that we are aware of is required to use the level of access protocols that are proposed for our facilities for general access. FIPS is a standard in the transition. It's a standard in mid-implementation. Yet it is the standard that was chosen to be used in an outdoor, humid, corrosive, rough maritime environment which has to move massive numbers of personnel as essentially its first venue. The Maritime Industry is essentially paying for the operational testing of this new standard; not only in terms of hardware, which is expensive unproven, but also in terms of and

productivity and congestion.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

Coast Guard Regulations are problematic in that they do not harmonize with the standard. Coast Guard Regulations require a TWIC authorization ramp up at different MARSEC levels. The FIPS standard seems to require a contact reader and a PIN to unlock the biometric on the card to meet any MARSEC level. We would ask the Coast Guard to re-evaluate their requirements in terms of the FIPS standards -- the authentication mechanisms in Section 62. The Regulations should follow one of these mechanisms. The mechanism selected should be realistic for our industry. We should not be subject to higher standards than the federal agencies governing us and for which the standard was designed.

17

18

19

20

21

22

The industry is completely dependent on TSA to choose a TWIC blank card for the entire maritime sector; however, the card chosen will have a profound effect on an access control system designed in hardware. TSA must be mindful of through put needs

of the terminals and the harsh environment in which the systems will be operating. A card requiring a contact reader and PIN at each entry simply will not work well in the marine terminal environment. We are aware of emerging technology that may meet the FIPS 201 standard. A card called a dual interface card has been developed. This card -- in this card -- contactless circuitry communicates with the contact circuitry. This card is read by a contactless reader. This card needs to be evaluated. We need to be able to take advantage of any new technology that will speed entry validation and harden the access control system.

The draft regulations require owners or operators to submit a TWIC Addendum within six months and require the owner or operator to have access control systems and equipment, including card readers, in conjunction with the TWIC that meet TSA Rule Standards within one year to 18 months after the final Rule, depending upon completion of TWIC enrollment. The time line and the requirements in 33 CFR 105, 115-

1	120 for the access control roll out are totally
2	unrealistic. Operational tests in carefully selected
3	pilot ports and terminals should be concluded and the
4	TSA data interfaces checked and proven before the
5	Access Control System is designed and the TWIC
6	Addendum created. It is unknown if the flexible roll
7	out with the anticipated date to be announced by
8	Notice in the Federal Register apply just to the TWIC
9	roll out or to both the TWIC and the Access Control
10	System. This needs to be clarified and focused, in
11	our opinion, on the Access Control System pilot time
12	line. Again
13	
14	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Please wrap it up.
15	
16	MARC MacDONALD: Again, please note we
17	are in production testing phase of an access control
18	system required the government facilities even before
19	the government facilities are required to do so.
20	Thank you. I will put my paper in the box.
21	
22	JOHN SCHWARTZ: Thank you. I would

like to ask -- we're going to have a lot of commenters today. If you could hold your applause until the end of the day, it will actually let us get more people through. So if we applaud after every speaker, I fear that there are gong to be some people that aren't going to get a chance to speak. Thanks.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

STEVE RUGGIERO: My name is Steve I'm the Director of Maritime Security at Ruggiero. Total Terminals International at the Hanjin Facility, the largest terminal at the Port of Long Beach. security issues taking such a precedence, our aim is to provide the most effect TWIC without impeding commerce or damaging the environment. The total labor man hours in our facility for 2006 will be 3 million, with our year-end totally 1.2 vessel moves, million gate moves, in and out of our terminal, and 290,000 container moves on and off our on-dock reel. In November 2004, a TWIC Prototype Program was place at 28 test sites nationwide. As one of these Prototype Facilities, we tested two types of biometric readers that used contactless cards. Both were tested indoors and outdoors at truck lanes. One of these was only serviced for five days, in which time, it was deemed inoperable due to weather conditions in the maritime environment. The second reader is still in use today and takes approximately three seconds to verify card and biometric identification.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

For those who understand the dire need for infallible security to the terminals, this is my proposal. Our need for contactless readers is to minimize possible damage to the hardware, unintentional and intentional. Understood that during the initial enrollment verification, something you have -- the card -- something you are -- biometric -and something you know -- a PIN -- will be verified and required. Later entry may be accomplished via a contactless card. Further, this type of reader will make the biometric card verification utilizing a oneto-one match and will be stronger authentication than the FIPS 201 at -- one and two every time through the There are no adverse effects to commerce and gate. labor forces with the contactless portion of the TWIC

card. A contactless card which utilizes a template meets the FIPS 201 standards and even exceeds these standards at a daily level. This is how the prototype functioned. This is how -- this is what has been proven. And this is what we want now.

We also understand the new Rule has been tested and certified by MIST and the FIPS 140-03, but are there any plans to use this technology in the TWIC roll out? If we weren't able to base the TWIC system on the contact-based card, the card itself would need to have a contact chip in all four corners. This is absolutely necessary so that the card may be read regardless of angle or direction of insert. Blockage at the gate has been verified to take less than five minutes upon entry, resulting in three-hour wait times or more. One driver alone is not our concern, but when you consider several drivers behind him and in turn behind them, you very quickly experience delays.

Additionally, if it were deemed that

the contact card is the only feasible option, we then must start the process from the beginning and run a prototype, specifically for the maritime environment, further delaying the TWIC system implementation.

Given that a PIN will be absolutely necessary, we would like for the PIN to be recognized through the contactless card, possibly using that dual interface technology. PINs will be assigned at issuance of the cards and necessary upon initial entry. However, in the event that the biometric check does not function, this would also enable the PIN to be utilized for access.

verification of federal employees and contractors; not private sector commerce. Does security have precedence over environmental regulations, such as specifically the Senate Bill 1829? If not, then again, we are further binding each terminal to a \$250 per hour for the first 30 minutes of aisle. Again, 300 or 400 trucks per aisle per hour for the first hour alone at

1	our facility.
2	
3	Additionally, the PKI Certification
4	expires after three years, and the TWIC has a life
5	span of five years. There is an immediate conflict of
6	the card, which makes it null and void after only
7	three years. Reissuance of the card must occur
8	simultaneously.
9	
LO	In closing, I suggest an Industry
L1	Committee be made up of maritime facilities and others
L2	to be put together and put forth for further
L3	discussion of this project.
L4	
L5	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
L6	
L7	PATRICK WILSON: Good morning. My name
L8	is Patrick Wilson, and I in no way represent the ILWU,
L9	because I am not a registered member yet; but that's
20	my affiliation. And I just have a couple of
21	questions. Am I to understand that this program is

not going to come into play until 18 months from the

21

22

end of 2006? And if so, what would be the date that you would be using to start looking back for the interim disqualifying offenses? And then another question that I had is if somebody at the time that the TWICs were issued -- like say they had been convicted eight years ago, but have only been out of prison for four and a half years, or had been convicted six and a half years ago, but out of prison for five, would they then be completely disqualified from ever getting a TWIC or would they be able to return to work and return to get a TWIC six months or a year later when they were able to qualify for a TWIC?

JOHN SCHWARTZ: We can't get into specifics, you know, of individuals, but I will say that the trigger for the look-back periods -- it starts with when the person applies for the TWIC. So when you apply for the TWIC, that's when we look back. Also, I think maybe I can just clarify as to when the program to start the initial enrollments we would hope to start by the end of this calendar year and then we

would proceed for approximately 18 months to reach all 750,000 workers.

3

4

2

1

PATRICK WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

5

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

6

ROB ZIFFNEY: Good morning. My name is Ziffney. Marketing with Rob Hirsch Ι am in Electronics. We are a supplier and manufacture of physical access control systems for TWIC and FIPS 201. I serve on the Board of Directors of the Security Industry Association. I am the Chair of the BIB working group there. I am also a member of the Interagency Advisory Board of the Physical Access I recognize the TWIC and FIPS 201 are different; but to the extent they are correlated, I offer the following comments on FIPS 201. Му observation is that FIPS 201 is IT driven, and only recently has the physical security industry had a We see that IT understanding of security is voice. basically a desktop card reader, next to a PC, used to

log on while you wait for XP to boot up. As we talk to very intelligent people that have designed a lot of these specifications, we found that there is no real understanding of controllers, outdoor environments or Security people waiting in line. The Industry Association, the Smart Card Alliance, and International Biometric Industry Association have all petitioned, primarily through the commenting periods on standards, they have all petitioned for allowing the use of biometric with contactless readers. The technology is there, but the specs are committed to contact.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

We have also requested the removal of requirement for а PINfrom the biometric. Historically we haven't used a PIN as a requirement with a biometric. We do know that recently MIST has relaxed the requirement for a PIN with PKI and they removed that. We believe these issues are critical for physical security applications. We need higher resistance to vandalism and weather. We need cost effective solutions. And we need to be able to enroll

both a PIN, a well as the number in the card, into your local access system, physical security system database. If a keypad and a PIN are dedicated just to unlocking the card and not to communicating with our Physical Access Systems as we've done in the past, then you have no local control over being able to use the PIN or the keypad for access. We need secured decision making on the secure side of the protected perimeter instead of just in a card on the attack side.

We have been told that it is privacy issues, not technology, that is our obstacle. What can we do? Unofficially, FIPS 201 is now open for some final comments until the end of this week. So I request that all in this room please submit your letters to MIST requesting removal of the requirement for PIN with biometric and requesting that we can use biometrics with contactless readers and have that changed in FIPS 201, which is the parent document to many other special publications. Please let them know that physical security is adversely impacted if you do

not do so. Thank you very much.

2

3

1

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

BILL CARSON: Good morning. My name is I am a Facility Security Office at Bill Carson. Transportation Service, one of International largest container stevedoring facilities in the Port ITS is the corporate office for two of Long Beach. other container facilities in the Port of Oakland and the Port of Tacoma. First I have a concern that I would like to address that is relative to the FIPS 201 requirement. This new standard requires a contact reader to identify a TWIC. This type of system will not be functional in the Marine Industry due to the environmental factors and questionable durability. The requirement also has procedures and processes, in addition to presenting the TWIC for each MARSEC level, including the usage of biometrics and entering a PIN number. The implementation of the biometrics and PIN number would add significant delays in employees reporting to work and would also hinder commerce.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

At all MARSEC levels, a contactless reader without the requirement of biometrics and PIN numbers should be acceptable since these individuals have already been vetted through the TWIC process, which is above and beyond any security level requirement currently.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As more information becomes available, the cost to implement the TWIC appears to be significant. How does the Coast Guard and TSA plan to minimize these costs to the facilities? Who is responsible for the TWIC equipment, implementation, maintenance, training and personnel to manage the system? We understand that the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach may be the first site of implementation on the TWIC. This is of concern that the largest port complex will be the test site for the implementation Can a much smaller port participate in the initialization of the TWIC before large ports like Los Angeles and Long Beach? With TSA being involved in implementing regulations on waterfront facilities,

1	will TSA inspect ITS and similar facilities? If so,
2	the TSA will need to become educated about our
3	facilities and operations that another agency is
4	already familiar with, educated on and conducting
5	similar, if not the same, type of inspections. Not
6	only would this type of procedure be counter-
7	productive for the TSA, but it would add another
8	agency inspection, regulation procedures and opinions
9	that the waterfront facilities will be required to
10	endure. Will the Coast Guard conduct the inspections
11	and handle these procedures on behalf of the TSA?
12	
13	Thank you for the opportunity to
14	express my comments.
15	
16	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
17	
18	JESSE CUEVAS: Good morning. My name
19	is Jesse Cuevas. I am the Facility Security Officer
20	for California Meda Terminal in Long Beach. We are a
21	unique operation in that we consist of break bulk

vessels and containerized operations as well.

22

1	weekly basis, we have 8,800 gate moves and 6,000
2	vessel moves.
3	
4	We are in support of the TWIC, but we
5	do have some concerns. Our concerns lie in
6	individuals entering the facility and are delayed or
7	denied for whatever reason they don't have their
8	card or the hardware is broken. That's going to cause
9	delays throughout the whole day. When you add that
10	up, it's going to slow down production which is the
11	driving force of our company and potentially affect
12	commerce as well. Thank you.
13	
14	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
15	
16	DAVID CONNOLLY: My name is David
17	Connolly. I'm a Vice-President for the Civil Unit
18	Pacific, and I represent unlicensed mainly
19	unlicensed Merchant Mariners.
20	
21	We have mixed feelings about these two
22	rulemakings. Generally, there are many things to like

in the Coast Guard's MMC and most of our objection is focused on the TSA side of the rulemaking. So our objections are many, and I am never going to be able to get it into four minutes, but let me say that we object to the cost of the process. We object to the definitions of mental incapacity. And I want to focus on two areas that I think are most problematic; and that is, the disqualifying criminal offenses and the issue of foreign mariners.

Taking foreign mariners first, we are doing again, with this rulemaking, what we've done in the past, building up -- when it comes to terrorism security -- building up our defenses where they are already strong. American Merchant Mariners are the most vetted, the most regulated mariners in the world; and yet, 95 percent of the mariners in our ports today are unknown, virtually undocumented. The Rule suggests that the ISTS Code will cover that. But we know that the ISTS Code relies on ILL 185 for documentation of merchant mariners, and there is no background check for the world's merchant mariners.

Most nation's privacy laws forbid that. So we don't have background checks on them; nor do positive I.D. -- positive identification. does not require that. There is no way for to know who these people are on foreign ships, as long as you are who you say you are, in international maritime So we think that the Coast Guard and TSA waiver. should use its own national security strategy of a risk-based approach to security by doing something about foreign mariners. And I have a simple and feasible suggestion -- require American mariners on every ship, all the time, when the ship is in U.S. Port Authority.

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

The other area I won't get into is the very, very dangerous of L&G Ships. There are undocumented mariners on some very, very dangerous vessels and cruise ships where many, many mariners, foreign mariners are employed without the Coast Guard or TSA understanding who is there.

21

22

20

Let me move quickly because I know I'm

running out of time to the criminal issue. The problem with this rulemaking in the criminal area is that it grafts the hazmat Commercial Driver Rules from the Patriot Act onto the maritime population that gets its statutory authority for the TWIC under the MTSA. So the hazmat Driver Rules were never intended for a maritime population, and they don't fit. imperfect and inappropriate use, and that's where it all starts because in the Patriot Act under hazmat Rules, the disqualifying offenses on the interim level, second tier, are automatic denials, automatic Not so under the MTSA where the disqualifiers. Secretary has to determine that there is a terrorism risk, there is a linkage between criminality and terrorism -- real security under the MTSA. And it is not in the Patriot Act, and there isn't in this rulemaking, and that's the problem.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Let me quickly move through some recommendations. Connect the felony record to real terrorism security risk. Issue an interim credential for those who have an interim disqualifying offenses.

Remove some felonies from the interim list altogether.
Drug distribution or possession of fire arms. The
connection between those offenses and terrorism
security risk is tenuous, is uncertain and it is not
fair to put somebody out of work forever for a mistake
that they made many years ago. Remove especially the
uncertain disposition of arrests from the threat
assessment. Many people have an arrest that is still
on their record for which they were never convicted.
The Coast Guard definition of conviction is much
broader than the criminal courts'. It's any
adjudication at all for anything that could have led
to a conviction. So if you plea bargain the case
and I have a member who did in 1968, a weapons
charge down to a drunken disorderly but the weapons
charge remains on the record. And there is an
uncertain disposition of arrest and a denial of a
TWIC, and it is wrong. It puts you out of work; and
in many cases, it will put people out of work forever.

Thank you. I will stop here.

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

MIGUEL LOPEZ: Good morning. My name Miquel Lopez. I'm here representing International Brotherhood of Teamsters Port Division. We represent over 5,500 longshoremen, clerks, truck drivers, tug boat deck hands, tow boat captains, and Port Authority employees, quards, service delivery employees and warehousemen who work in our nations' ports. The Teamsters generally support some concept TWIC. Security at our ports is porous deficient and is long overdue for repair. The Teamsters have several concerns regarding particular aspects of the proposed Rules. The Teamsters are concerned with the unlimited look-back period, the overly broadness of disqualifying offenses and the viability of those aspects of your plan. Teamsters believe strongly that there needs to be an Administrative Law Judge to hear appeals of any TSA Determination.

21

22 In addition, the Teamsters are

concerned that most port drivers will be unable to afford the costs of a TWIC card. Though Congress mandated that the TWIC Program be paid by user fees, at no point did Congress say that the fees must be paid by the users who can least afford them; rather than those stakeholders who reap enormous profits from this booming international trade.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

I want to take this opportunity to raise a serious concern with the cost assumptions you've used in developing this Program. According to your figures, you assume a 12 percent annual turn over of the workers covered by this Program. Yet the American Trucking Association indicates that average turn over rater for non-union truck drivers is over 130 percent. It is their belief that the turnover in the inter-mobile container hauling sector is even higher. This is crucial to the success of this program, since using your figures, TSA estimates a five-year turn over of 410,000 for all port workers. Using ATA figures, you would have a five-year turn over of 572,000 for port truck drivers alone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Why are there are such high turnover rates in port trucking? Port trucking is dominated by hundreds of tiny, under-capitalized motor carriers. There are over 600 motor carriers serving the ports of L.A. and Long Beach alone, which average fewer than 25 drives hired as equipment, lease contract drivers. These motor carriers are not accountable for their They operate without paying FICA taxes, drivers. workers compensation, unemployment insurance, often without truck liability insurance; but they control the access to terminals and the dispatch of their cargo. These abusive working conditions, along with unsustainable compensation, drive inter-mobile container truckers to leave the industry and search for work elsewhere.

17

18

19

20

21

22

We recognize that addressing the underlying problems of driver abuse is beyond the purview of TSA and the Coast Guard, but we urge you to recognize these issues because they will prevent successful implementation of TWIC. What we believe

TSA and the Coast Guard can do is to work closely with Port Authority and terminal operators while TWIC is being implemented to find ways to help stabilize the port trucking industry so that TWIC can make our ports more secure. Possible bifurcation of the targeted transportation workforce, accessibility to covered facilities, could be a first step. Common sense tells us that the lesser number to secure can be more easily secured.

Requiring facility staging areas for cargo will remove thousands of drivers from a TWIC process and further secure the port employees' work areas. If drivers do not have access to terminals, they don't need a TWIC. If you have a secure -- if you have staging areas that allow them to access the cargo and move it while the employees who are actually employed to prepare and move the cargo out of the terminals -- which are the longshoremen -- that would be an answer as to reducing the number of people who would be required to submit to TWIC processing.

1	With that, I thank you for your time.
2	This is respectfully submitted by the Teamsters Union.
3	
4	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
5	
6	OFFICER OLSON: Good morning. My name
7	is Olson. I'm an officer of Local 13 at the ILWU. I
8	also have the honor or the curse, if you will, of
9	representing perhaps 100,000 workers as the only Labor
10	Representative on our Area Maritime Security
11	Committee. I know the president put in a bulletin, and
12	we have 7,000 members plus, that all the questions
13	regarding homeland security should be addressed to me.
14	The Secure Project hit the fan and three days later,
15	my cell phone messages maxed out at just under 100 a
16	day. They still fill up every night. I have followed
17	your road show. I don't want to ask you questions
18	that you already said you have no answers for. But I
19	would like to field a couple of the things I have to
20	answer on the phone.
21	
22	My stock answer for why is this

happening is that the Administration has been getting a lot of flack for lack of port security and we're an easy target, and there is not a whole lot we can do about it. If you have a more accurate or honest I'd like to hear it. You're in the unfortunate position -- you are poised to enforce security as defined by the individual terminals within your Terminal Security Plans. Now, your directions for filling out these plans encouraged them designate the entire facility as a secure area. As an example, workers we have in this port -- there is a vessel planner. This man has the power to decree that the can of anthrax powder should be placed directly on top of the can of explosives. We might agree that this guy should be scrutinized.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

On the other hand, there is a guy who is driving a bulldozer on a scrap job where the Union and employer have worked together to waive the California Public Safety Rules because the safest way we find to put this guy on what essentially is a peak of hundreds of tons of razor blades is to lift him

with the gear aboard the ship. Gentlemen, you couldn't design a better principle. You could have Jack the Ripper driving that bulldozer, parade prostitutes around him all night and go to bed secure in the knowledge that you will awake without a hair on anybody harmed, unless poor Jack fell off the bulldozer.

However, this job and this situation are designated as secure areas. I'd like to know if any one of you on the panel actually believes that simply because this is designed in a plan, that every square inch of the terminal that should be secure or that every job on every terminal involves access to what should be a secure area.

Longshoremen are in the immediate area of the ports we work, some of us, our situation, have done so for our generations. We are the vulnerable here. The people who should be helping you and the people you should be protecting. We are the guys here 24/7. But we are just trying to perpetuate that fifth

generation. I was going to offer to bet my bird against any one of yours that you will not find a registered longshoreman on this post so long as you have them in security threat. Given the careers of the TSA people lately, well they be here any minute, so I won't do that.

Financially, we have better shape in Vegas than what we got here. At least there, you win sometimes. Here, aside from the tax money you are paying for all of this, you're asking a longshoreman to make a sizeable bet where the gamble is if he hits the jackpot, he loses his job. Thank you.

MIKE MITRE: Good morning. A hard act to follow. On behalf of the International Long Shore Warehouse Union, I want to thank you for the opportunity to allow us to come here and testify this morning. My name is Mike Mitre. I'm the Director of Port Security for the Coast Wide Union from Canada to Mexico. The ILWU has been directly involved in the TWIC process from the beginning. We've met regularly

with TSA, with Homeland Security, with the Department of Transportation, who originated the process.

The ILWU, while fully supportive of all actions to create and improve port security, which we've shown, we have grave concerns regarding flaws that may render the whole TWIC Program less than adequate. We understand the TSA has interest in eventually extending the TWIC Program general modes of transportation to other unions directly covered by the MPRM and that's why we are so concerned. This thing can go much further, and you've got to get it right the first time.

Again, we thank you for having us here today. Let me clearly state that no one wants to secure our ports more than the ILWU. As I said before, we have a vested interest. We're the front lines. Our guys work here and we live within five miles of a port in most cases. If something happens, we're the ones who are going to get hammered first. We understand that access control procedures,

including tamper-resistant ID cards like the TWIC card are a part of this effort. We understand the need for them, and we support initiatives to identify and to bar individuals who pose a real terrorism security risk. One of our big things is — who does pose this risk? We really don't feel it's the longshoreman who has been here for 70 and 80 years; and as has been said before, there are three and four generations of longshoremen in this port, as well as in all the ports up and down this coast. And I am sure it's the same on the East Coast with the ILA.

The TWIC Program has to strike the right balance. It must enhance the security or transportation system while it preserves the rights of all workers and all people. And this all has to be accomplished without unduly infringing on the flow of commerce, which we have just recently seen with all the articles coming out in the newspapers about some ships being warned of inspections and others not in these supposedly random inspections. What we can't be allowed to do is to unjustly punish employees for

decisions that were made years and years ago. On this point, I want to acknowledge the work of the committee when they drafted Section 70105 of the MTSA Act, it established the requirements and limits Transportation Security Card. While they weren't perfect, these are important protections limitations, and I feel that sometimes they are being run over as the TWIC Program goes on because very 70105 individuals clearly said \_\_\_ that transportation security risks on terrorism. And I think we've gone past that. I think that the disqualifiers are too broad. I think some of those things can be let out. And you know, what really can this committee do? Are we beyond that? congressional problem now? I'm asking rhetorically. I don't need an answer right now. I will ask some questions in a minute.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

There is little doubt that TSA and the Coast Guard had a challenging task in drafting this.

No doubt. And while we appreciate the fact that in many regards the end results follows the mandates of

70105 otherwise and attempts to put forth reasonable, workable program, unfortunately, said, there are areas where we feel it has fallen There are a few other areas that the ILWU is very concerned with. Other than the disqualifying offenses, we are very concerned with the waiver process, including the use of an Administrative Law Judge, also known as ALJ's, and subjective decisions that are incorporated in the process. Wе concerned with parts of the document. We are concerned about a Transportation Security Exam and how it is going to be specifically defined and how it is going to be defined in conjunction with the card and with possible people that are considered to be in violation of this. And then we are concerned with privacy rights.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Before I finish, I'd like to ask a couple of quick questions. Obviously, we just went through a vetting process. And this vetting process was -- to put it real simply -- I may put it in the wrong words -- was comparing individual workers

1	against the no-fly list or the terrorism list. We
2	were notified that truckers weren't necessarily part
3	of this process at the beginning. Can any of you
4	answer me, were truckers part of the vetting process?
5	
6	CAPTAIN FRANK STURM: No, they were
7	not.
8	
9	MIKE MITRE: Okay. So
10	
11	CAPTAIN FRANK STURM: We're here to
12	take comments on the TWIC. I don't want to get into
13	the interim vetting processes. I am sure plenty of
14	other people have questions about that.
15	
16	MIKE MITRE: Well, let me
17	
18	CAPTAIN FRANK STURM: I don't mean it
19	as a negative. We will be happy to answer your
20	questions at Coast Guard Headquarters.
21	
22	MIKE MITRE: Okay. Thank you. The

1	reason I say this though is this once we get into
2	the TWIC process okay, we are going to do
3	longshoremen, no problem. But what happens when you
4	get to the truckers? Once again and that's why I
5	brought it up not in terms of the vetting process,
6	but in the TWIC once again, are we going to have a
7	problem that part of the labor force is going to be
8	included? Say, longshoremen and other people and non-
9	union truckers that really make up a lot of the
10	industry, because it's difficult, are they going to be
11	excluded?
12	
13	LUKE HARDEN: The proposal is that all
13 14	LUKE HARDEN: The proposal is that all individuals who have unescorted access to secured
14	individuals who have unescorted access to secured
14 15	individuals who have unescorted access to secured areas would have to have the TWIC Cards. So if that's
14 15 16	individuals who have unescorted access to secured areas would have to have the TWIC Cards. So if that's union truckers, non-union truckers, longshoremen,
14 15 16 17	individuals who have unescorted access to secured areas would have to have the TWIC Cards. So if that's union truckers, non-union truckers, longshoremen, management, whomever would have access to that area
14 15 16 17 18	individuals who have unescorted access to secured areas would have to have the TWIC Cards. So if that's union truckers, non-union truckers, longshoremen, management, whomever would have access to that area
14 15 16 17 18	individuals who have unescorted access to secured areas would have to have the TWIC Cards. So if that's union truckers, non-union truckers, longshoremen, management, whomever would have access to that area unescorted would have to have the TWIC Card.

MIKE MITRE: Let me ask one question to finish up please? One question. At the end of the 18-month period of the implementation, if there are truckers, non-union truckers that don't have it, they will not be allowed access on the terminal? Is that the thought now so far?

LUKE HARDEN: People how have unescorted access have to have the TWIC Card, and it's left up to the owner and operator to determination the implementation plan for how this is going to be applied. But yes, the intention is for everyone -- everyone is going to have to have a TWIC Card.

MIKE MITRE: Okay. Thank you very much for letting me give comment. I appreciate it.

MARK MENDOZA: First of all, I would like to thank you for allowing us to speak. My name is Mark Mendoza. I am the president of the Long Shore Local 13, Southern Cal. I'd like to speak about the

disqualifying offenses. The Union remains concerned
that the list of penalty offenses that will disqualify
a worker from holding a Maritime TWIC is too big and
not adequately focused on eliminating true security
risks. Section 70105 is clear. For penalty
convictions, an individual may not be denied a
Security Card unless the individual has been convicted
within the past seven years or released from
incarceration in the last five for a felony that the
Secretary believes could cause the individual to be a
terrorism security risk to the United States. We
maintain that some of the broad descriptions of
disqualifying offenses listed in Section 49 CFR go
beyond this mandate and its limitation. Again, in
looking at criminal records, the Secretary may only
deny a card to someone who could impose a terrorism
security risk. By way of example, the MPRM says that
all felonies involving dishonesty, fraud or
misrepresentation make an individual at least an
initial terrorism security risk. If a worker is
convicted of a felony in writing bad checks, that
would appear to qualify as a crime of dishonestly or

fraud. We understand why a financial institution may not want to hire this person. We simply do not understand how that makes an individual a terrorism security risk, unqualified to work in a port. Simply put, there needs to be a cleaner nexus between terrorism security and the crimes that will disqualify an individual from holding a Maritime TWIC.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

The TSA and the Coast Guard note in the MPRM that they are adopting the disqualifying offenses currently in place for the Federal hazmat Programs. While we agree that the two programs should be as similar as possible, it must be remembered that the hazmat Program and the Maritime TWIC Programs are governed by two different statutes. Specifically, Section 1012 of the U.S. Patriot Act, USC 508 (a) grants TSA broader direction in deciding that crimes will disqualify someone from the industry and how far back the criminal records should be examined. Section 70105(c) places more limits on the Secretary for the Maritime Program. Only those crimes that make someone a terrorism security risk to the United States

should be included. We believe that it is critical that the list of criminal offenses be consistent with the MTSA standard. While TSA claimed it was adopting the such an approach, we continue to believe that the crimes adopted for the hazmat Programs and proposed for Maritime TWIC do not, in fact, meet the standards established in Section 70105.

The union appreciates the inclusions of a waiver process in Section 70105. It should not be used as excuse to adopt an overly broad list of felonies and allow inherent problems to go unaddressed. The union's feeling on a terrorism security risk is not a decision that can be casually rendered. The burden alone should overcome the label from then on will be an onus.

Furthermore, the TSA will need to review and process the criminal histories of maritime related workers pursuant to this on an extremely tight deadline. As many are saying all over the country, it is obvious that the TWIC Program is now being fast

tracked after years of little to no movement at all.

On top of other procedural challenges inherent in this
program, it makes no sense to overload the waiver
process with the individuals that should never be
disqualified in the first place.

Now listen, I myself am like the military vets up there. I am a military vet. I have numerous of my local that are military vets. I served my -- I am from a family of vets. From my brother to my father-in-law being a colonel. My brother being an officer. My uncles. And now, some of my members that are overseas right now serving in the war, for whatever reason they did, they are going to come back here and now they pose a threat to the United States of America? I've got a problem with that. And I think you need to look a little deeper into what you are trying to impose here. We are the first line of defense. Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Than you.

DAVID GONZALES: Good morning. My name is David Gonzales. I'm the President of Local 10, Long Shore, up in San Francisco, Oakland Bay Area. I'd like to talk to you about the waiver process and As indicated earlier, the unions talked with members of Congress in negations that led to Section 70105 and the inclusion of a waiver process was a major priority. We were there when the TSA chose to incorporate the waiver process. We are concerned, however, that the waiver process requires workers to apply back to the very same agency that determined that the individual was a security risk in the first place. Given the public anxiety regarding terrorism and the insular nature of this process, concerned the TSA might reject waivers that may have otherwise been meritorious.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

In an attempt to address this problem, we have asked the TSA to allow workers to have their waiver cases heard at some point in the process before an administrative law judge at a hearing on the record. This would allow employees to make their cases

in front of an impartial decision maker not bound by political pressures or subject to agency interference. In addition, ALJ decisions would establish precedent helping to better define what constitutes an actual security risk. This will introduce a level of fairness and consistency to assist in that essential link between employee rights and national security.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

There is currently a rule in Congress to address on this point, including the pending Coast Guard Re-Authorization Congress Report HR-889. we understand that the Congress Report is being held up for unrelated reasons, the bipartisan support for the introduction of ALJ's into the TWIC process is clear. The ILWU would specifically like to thank Senator Stevens, Republican from Alaska and Senator Inouye, the Democrat from Hawaii, for their help on Why would we want -- why would we not this issue. want to include an ALJ in the TWIC process? made by the TSA and the Coast Guard stating that they will alter the process if Congress changes the law are all fine and good. However, we're talking here about

possibly taking away a worker's right to feed and support his family. While we have every confidence that Congress will act, it is troubling that the TSA and the Coast Guard will refuse to include ALJ's on a technicality. This is just too serious an issue. While these agencies clearly have the discretion to include ALJ's in the process, their continued raises regarding resistance concern that they implement and incorporate fairness into the system. I should note that the ALJ process, to be effective, cases may be heard and decided as expeditiously as possible so that the employees are not unjustly barred from returning to work. Thank you.

14

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MICHAEL BRIAN: Good morning. I am Michael Brian. I am the Port Facilities Security Officer for the Port of Oakland, and I welcome this opportunity to supply comments this morning. The Port of Oakland is the fourth largest, fourth busiest, excuse me, container port in the United States, with

a record of 2.3 billion TEU's through 2005. Wе anticipate continuing an annual growth of 10 percent for the foreseeable future. While they truly apply to support efforts to insure the port work force is secure and it does not pose a threat to the American transportation system, I am concerned with these proposed access control systems which will very well impede the flow of commerce; and thereby have a negative impact the regional and national on economies.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

First off, I'd like to comment on system costs. As shown earlier in the presentation, the cost to Marine terminal facilities in the U.S. is estimated in the notice to account for 38.9 percent of the \$1.03 billion 10-year cost of the program, which would be about 400 million dollars. With gate readers required at all the pedestrian and truck access control pedestals and all out gates, I think the cost will be much higher. From experience with similar projects through the Port of Oakland and the Security Grant Process, the Port of Oakland received \$2.5

million to install the first round of Automated Pedestrian Access Control System across seven of our marine terminals. The port share in that project was about \$631,000, for a total cost of \$3.13 million. If you do the math, that's about \$430,000 per terminal. Earlier, they said the average was estimated to be about \$100,000 cost per terminal. And this was just for the pedestrian side of the Access Control System that was installed three years ago.

I believe the TWIC System installation costs across all marine terminals, both pedestrian and truck access, both inbound and outbound, in the Port of Oakland could be between eight and 10 million dollars, which does not include operation, maintenance and technical support of the system. These costs are very significant, and I think they are vastly understated in the notice.

Regarding enrollment centers, from my understanding, the enrollment center location hasn't been determined, but with 5,000 longshoremen, truckers

and marine terminal workers, the Port of Oakland required plans for access to the marine terminals. I highly recommend that at least one enrollment center be placed in an easily accessible location to Oakland.

Regarding Coast Guard Verification, I recommend under 49 CFR 1572.41, that the Coast Guard, not TSA, be the agency that evaluates, inspects and tests for compliance with Part 1572. This is consistent with the Coast Guard's responsibility to verify regulated marine facilities that are conducting access control activities in accordance with their approved security facility plans. To add TSA to that mix is potentially confusing to the marine terminal. Access Control procedures at marine terminals should be verified by only one federal agency.

Regarding lost card procedures, I did not see a policy in the notice about a worker's status who has lost his TWIC card during the time it takes to process and issue a new card. Is he still authorized unescorted access? What are the procedures for this

I think that's optimistic for getting your card back.

Can he be issued a receipt of some sort that shows he lost his card and the process has been initiated to replace his card?

Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Michael.

RAY LYMAN: Good morning. Thank you for being here to listen to our comments today. My name is Ray Lyman. I work for Catalina Express, and I'm a board member with the Passenger Vessel Association. Having gone through the document of the proposed Rule, I have far too many concerns to try and comment on them in my allotted amount of time here today. Instead, I wish to try and make you understand a little about our industry and the huge differences between our vessels and facilities and those of the big container, bulk and product facilities moving international trade within the ports. We understand

the enormous political pressure your departments are experiencing to make the ports secure and safe. However, it should be even more important to do it right; not to put industries out of business and bring the U.S. economy to its knees.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

With that said, I'd like to hand each of you a copy of a few photographs that depict our facilities and vessels. I would like to have you look at these photos while I describe their content and the scenarios we work with in the domestic trade of carrying passengers on small passenger vessels. Is it all right if I bring those up? The first photo you see there is our main corporate headquarters under the Vincent Thomas Bridge here at Berth 95 in Los Angeles. Overall, you can see the terminal itself, the parking lots that surround it, which, again, this is a public access area to where all you have to do is take a ticket and promise to pay to leave to get into that The next page, if you look at it, an aerial area. view of that same spot, the bottom part of that is a group of camp kids within our terminal waiting to go

over to one of the youth camps on Catalina Island. Again, public access terminal owned by the Port of L.A. We can't even lock the doors at night because of the public use for the rest rooms and so on and so The next page, if you look at it, it's our forth. Long Beach facility right here in downtown Long Beach. There is a crowd of people waiting to get on the boats in both of those pictures. I'd like you to understand that there's a bike path that goes between our ticket and terminal facility and the dock facility. Wе cannot block that bike path. That is regulated by the State of California and the Costal Commission. The next page is our Queen Mary facility, again here in Long Beach. That is a mobile unit, trailers that have been put together. Access, once again, through a parking lot for the public use. Again, photograph of that as well.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Again, after reading the TWIC proposed rule, I see so many aspects that if enacted without substantial change would handicap our company and the small passenger vessel industry. I will be submitting

a detailed comment to the docket regarding our concerns. At this time, however, I ask that you work with the Passenger Vessel Association to create an alternative plan for identifying our employees. Many of the member companies of PVA operate under an approved ASP, an alternative security plan, which we developed through the Coast Guard for our domestic operating companies. We appreciate our continued working relationship with the Coast Guard, including our partnership action teams, natural working groups that over the years have created regulations or navics that have made our industry safe and secure.

With the current domestic scenarios, fuel prices and environmental pollution, public transportation needs to be a growing industry that private companies such as Catalina Express can operate within the multitude of regulations, and public passenger vessel operations around the country can operate within a budget that taxpayers will tolerate.

In closing, I thank you -- I ask you to

realize the enormous differences between passenger
vessel operations and the ports of the United States
and the international operations moving the world's
products in and out of our country. In the small
passenger vessel industry, we are spending millions of
dollars to market our businesses to bring the public
into our facilities and on to our vessels; while the
big international product facilities that should be
the target industry of your TWIC are spending millions
dollars to keep the public out. A one size fits all
approach to employee identification and access within
the vessel operations in the United States will not be
practicable. Again, please work with the passenger
vessel industry to develop a program that will be of
equivalent value in securing our industry while
allowing small businesses to survive the economic
challenges of today.

19 Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Ray. Based
on our time, we are going to have time for four,

possibly five, more at the most. So, we will try to keep it tight, but I'm saying four for sure; maybe five.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

CAPTAIN DAVID BOEDER: Good morning. I'm Captain David Boeder of the Masters, Mates and Pilots. Wе represent over 6,000 licensed deck Any true, proper examination of security officers. has to be done objectively. We have to remove the rose colored glasses. You can add any requirements you want to American merchant seamen, but will not make these ports appreciably more safe because 95 percent of the ships are crewed by foreigners. Thev are not Americans. They are not subject to anything we're talking about in this room today. So we have a little bit of a difficulty saying the TWIC is that useful. For a merchant mariner, we have one national card now; but the government has not had any federal preemption, so whereas I have a card, which is great, it's a TWIC, but if I go to Miami, I have to have a Port of Miami Card. If I go to Everglades, I have to have a Port of Everglades Card. If I go to a special

terminal here, I may have to have a special terminal card. So I have a whole briefcase full of cards and I get to carry it around and TWIC doesn't help me there.

Additionally, terminals can add any other type of security they want. In certain cases, in Texas, they are actually charging seamen to go to shore because they have to be escorted by a guard and the seaman has to be paid -- has to pay the guard. This is indirect conflict with the ISPS Code. Foreigners don't have to match the ISPS Code, and we've decided that it's good enough for them; but we have to, as Americans, do more.

And lastly, I'd like to talk a little bit about due process. The present due process is similar to receiving a traffic ticket from a traffic officer and then having the opportunity to appeal to that traffic officer to rescind the ticket. It really doesn't make a lot of sense. So we do support a TWIC idea, but we would expect to have a little bit longer

comment period and a little more deliberation because, as the gentleman before me said, this is a major thing. We've got to get it right the first time.

4

5

1

2

3

Thank you.

6

7

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MICHAEL LIZATICH: Good morning. Му name is Michael Lizatich. I'm with the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, and I also represent the merchant mariner officers of about 5,000 and plus members on tow boats and other means of maritime transportation through the United States. thing, I'd like to echo the same sentiment of Captain Dave Boeder and Dave Connolly about the unfairness that falls upon the American Merchant Marine with regards to the ISPI Code and foreign mariners -- that they are not really checked out and they are going to have access in and out of our ports. And at the same time, we go through these extensive background checks, and the same thing. You know, we are going to have to

go through another check, and another card, to have access. And I feel that that is very unfair.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

The Merchant Mariner Document is document that I feel is a TWIC Card. We have a document that allows us a background check over and over again and vetted. But I understand the necessity of a TWIC Card. Like I said, we are, you know, going in that direction. And I was talking about the TWIC Card is that, you know, as mariners, we see very many ports in the United States. And if we do have a TWIC Card, there is times when a gentleman gets hurt or has a family emergency. He has to leave the ship. need another crew member within a couple of hours. Now, if we can have a TWIC Card with some type of designation that will allow us to get in and out of ports throughout the country without going through a second check at different ports and could delay the process of crewing a vessel or getting our members to that work, even for the mariner to go to and from the shore, you know. You allow him barge tow up the coast and you want to maybe have some free time.

Now, you don't have that particular card for that particular small port, and you might not be denied access. So, if these TWIC cards could have some designation on the level of access throughout the United States, that would really help out the Maritime Merchant Marine.

But like I say, we have been checked, background checked, through war and peace, and I feel that the Merchant Marine and the Mariners, over 200,000 of them, we are the biggest block that is affected by this -- we are not the terrorist threat. We have to look into the foreign sailors side because they are -- from the oceanside access, they have a lot more numbers than American U.S. Merchant Marines.

Thank you for the comment time -- the time to comment.

21 CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

CAPTAIN FRANK STURM: Let me just comment real quick. It's been raised a few times now about foreign workers. The TWIC is a card that is designed to entitle people to unescorted access. It is true that foreign workers are not eligible for the TWIC. Therefore, they are not entitled to unescorted access. So, when foreign workers, a foreign Mariner or anyone without a TWIC card is in vision -- when they arrive at a terminal facility or on the ship, they will not be allowed unescorted access.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

ED PASKOVSKIS: Good morning. My name is Ed Paskovskis. I'm the Deputy Director of the Port of Everett. Everett is in the Pacific Northwest, and I want to thank the Panel for the opportunity to speak The Transportation Security Agency and the to you. Coast Guard have been very helpful to us in the port industry. I speak for the Port of Everett. Clearly, looking back on the work that we did with our security planning, it was helpful to have a very dedicated, planned schedule that we could comply with. the things Ι would suggest for the TWIC

implementation, there seems to be a little bit of uncertainty in terms of the schedule. The issue of a TWIC is most complex, as mentioned by the other folks, but our concern in the port industry, at least in Everett, is the issue of what do we do with the folks that don't have the TWIC card and how do we escort them with the limited resource that we have at the gate.

At the Port of Everett, we are the terminal operator, and it's our responsibility to make sure that we are in compliance with our plan. Many small ports face a tremendous difficulty in doing the people side of security. Now, to have additional people at the gate, it is not uncommon for truck drivers to come in with their families and children. Are we to set up some day care centers up at the gate? You know, we are not prepared for that. There's some issues that we continually try to seek to resolve, and it takes planning in terms of budgetary planning. It's a public agency. We need advance notice to notify our elected officials what the budget is. On

face value, the \$139 TWIC card seems like a nominal fee; but adding it over thousands of people -- and not to mention some technology that is not clear at this point -- we don't know what to ask our elected officials in terms of budgeting needs. So, to comply with your schedule, it would be very helpful to know what is the basis of your phasing. The current information we have read indicates that there is three-group phasing. Is that going to be based on a threat of vulnerability assessment of individual public and private ports? And when will we know so we can start planning?

One just little suggested idea is -you mention you will have facilities throughout the
country for people to get their TWIC card, and you
indicate that the employee will be the one going to
those sites. That is a tremendous burden on the
employer. With respect to lack of productivity, is
there an opportunity to have those centers open on
weekends or nights so that we can coordinate with our
day-to-day work activities? I leave you with that

practical thought. We thank you for your time, and funding is a critical issue for us at the Port of Everett, and I am sure of many of our other fellow ports.

5

1

2

3

4

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

6

CHRIS GALLUP: Good morning. My name is Chris Gallup. I represent Lake Tahoe Cruises. operate two boats up there up at Lake Tahoe, and the way that this is written, I believe that we will fall into this category of having TWIC cards. We have two 500 passenger boats that primarily make their money in a summer season's three months. We compete with casinos and land-based operations for our guests and our employees as you can see, the cost involved in this. We do all of our hiring in May and lay them all off in September. A large number of those people are K1 Visa or foreign exchange students. I am sure you can see they don't have a detrimental effect on us. And we are just asking for an exemption by water way. have worked with the PBA to find alternative

solutions. We already do a background check on our employees. A criminal background check that takes about three days, and it goes back 10 years, and it costs about \$15.

5

1

2

3

4

Thank you.

7

8

6

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MILA PAVEK: Hello. My name is Mila Pavek. I'm a Facility Security Officer for Sea Launch and we are a little unusual in that we're a satellite launch surface provider that just happens to have some vessels. One of the major issues I have is -- we have a lot of foreign partners who come in by a Visa program. So, according to what you have up there, they are not even legal. They don't even have unrestricted access. Legal by the Visa program, but it is an unrestricted work access. Also, they come and go when we need them. So, a delay in their coming could be very detrimental to our service. We have a lot of areas that organize according to the Technology

Control. I have a monitor from the State Department pretty much all the time. There are areas I can't go into for technology control reasons even though I am the Facility Security Officer without escort. So how would I get these people — how would they be informed if there was a problem. They don't speak English. Our working language is Russian and English. They don't need to speak English. They don't live in the country, and they may come and go rapidly. How would they apply? How would they go for their biometrics? How would they pick it up? It's similar, I think, to the foreign student. That needs to be addressed for some of the unique facilities like us.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Also with customers. Our U.S. customers, it may be inconvenient. But we foreign customers that come from all How would they apply? We already have a countries. problem that firms that deal with technology, due to the technology controls from the State Department there is already a negative view of dealing with the United States because of ITAR. And this is something that could affect our business. So, if our employees can't even arrive, and we have had Visa issues in the past, and our customers — they come and they go, but if now it's a controlled area, they take over a controlled area on site, maybe I can work the Coast Guard to redefine my area somehow. But if you're going to stick to the areas I have now, I have major issues in how I am going to do that in a timely manner without chasing away business because the Government has made it too difficult for us to work with foreign partners.

As for the TWIC readers themselves, there are the issues of marine environment; but we have -- I am still not -- I don't think the definition of secure area is clear. It says where you have access control. Well, we have no public access. And I have 22 doors on my U.S. controlled areas alone. If I go into my Payload Processing Facility, I have to harden them against explosives because of the nature of the nature of the chemicals we deal with. So, the \$8,000 to \$11,000 is completely ridiculous in terms of

what I will have to do to deal with it. So, again, I might be able to work with the Coast Guard and look at my controlled areas or my secure areas and see what we can do. But there are some areas that indicate just to come on the site, some that seem to be at the entrance to each area. So, it could be a little clearer how you expect that to work.

I know we're not talking about 33 CFR 125, but I think you can be clearer on how that is going to evolve into the TWIC. Apparently, the card is going to be a new I.D., but I have people I have to submit for that who I don't necessarily need to get a TWIC. Just how will that relate in the future? Also, you talked about lost cards. If the power goes off, we talked about that in a meeting at port. What are the minimum requirements for an alternate process to let people in?

Well, I have a lot of others, but I think those are the big ones, and I will put the rest of them right here. Thank you.

2 CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

3

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you please
5 -- on the record -- can you please tell exactly what

6 type of operations you do?

7

8

9

MILA PAVEK: We launch satellites from a converted crude oil platforms at the Equator. Our home port is in Long Beach.

11

10

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. We are going to have to cut right there for lunch, but I would ask that the group, we will certainly try to remember, but the rest of the group respect the fact that these gentlemen waited. After lunch, we are going to start with the next title, but I would ask that you respect that these gentlemen have waited in line. When we go to the open session at the end, we would like to take these guys first.

STEPHEN RYBICKI: Good afternoon, and
thank you for the thoughtful comments that we heard
this morning. Along the lines of the thoughtful and
passionate comments, I'd ask that you submit specific
examples of some of the topics, whether it's a
disqualifying offense, alternative security programs,
to the docket, and that you include that. If it
includes specific confidential company information or
SSI material, there are provisions for including that
to another address. The other point I want to make is
that, as Jim said, the court reporter is taking
verbatim transcript and it should be posted to the
docket in about a week. So, if you want to see who is
speaking and what was discussed, you can probably read
that within a week or so. And we will be back after
lunch and we will go into the same thing. But I want
to strongly encourage you to submit those comments to
the docket, and those comments will be thoroughly
reviewed, and we may be changing the Rule based on
those comments. So, it's your opportunity to provide
those comments in. Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Steve.

Okay, we will be starting back up at 1:00.

(OFF THE RECORD FOR LUNCH BREAK)

(12:00 P.M. TO 1:00 P.M.)

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: I would now like to turn the mic over to Luke Harden to provide an overview of the TWIC Program and the changes to Title 33.

## TITLE 33: OVERVIEW

## LUKE HARDEN

announcement before I begin. We do get some questions at the lunch time at these public meetings. And we received one about how to submit comments to the docket. And as we stated before, we do highly encourage to put your thoughts in writing and submit them to the docket since the four minutes is somewhat limiting as far as the amount you can communicate. We also encourage you to be very, very specific in your

comments. But essentially I wanted to point out that on the first page of the Federal Register Notice, there are instructions on how to do this, and there are a couple of different ways of doing it. You can do it by snail mail, and you can also do it by e-mail and fax. And I encourage you to read that section because there are specific requirements that we ask you to be specific about. So, take a look at that first page regarding written comments.

I'd also like to thank again everyone for being here and making your comments. These are actually extraordinarily helpful to us as we consider how we are going to move forward publishing the final rule and how to roll out the TWIC program. So, thanks very much.

What I would like to do now is take the next 10 minutes and talk about the proposed changed to 33 CFR, Parts 101 to 106. These regulations are otherwise known as 33 CFR, subchapter H, and essentially these are more recently written -- or

recently written regulations in order to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act. They were published and promulgated in 2002. And, essentially, they established a framework for Maritime Security and do things like establish facility and vessel plan requirements and so forth. So, the objection -- one of the objectives of this rule -- was to fold in the TWIC requirements into the already existing framework, regulatory framework for MTSA. It does seem like folks in the room are pretty familiar with this already, judging by the first round of comments. for the benefit of everyone else, I would just like to give you a broad brush overview of some of the proposed changes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Since the purpose of this rule is to enhance port security by requiring a TWIC card for folks who have unescorted access to secured areas in facilities and vessels, some definitions are in order. And you see four basic definitions up on the screen before you. Secure Area is the first one, and that's rather broadly defined. Essentially, this is the area

where the facility or vessel exercises access control. And this is not to be confused with a definition that is already in the regulations called Restricted Areas. The Restricted Area is an infrastructure or location where it is required to have limited access and a higher degree of security. So, the Restricted Area and Secure Area locations could be one and the same, or in a lot of cases, Restricted Area could be a subset of I'll give you an example. a Secure Area. vessel, you may have an owner/operator designate his or her restricted areas as places like the engine room or the pilot house where the secure area may be designated by the owner/operator to be the entire vessel because that's where that person exercises access control.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

And I also bring your attention to another definition. Recurring Unescorted Access which is a specific provision for vessels, taking into account the unique environment a vessel is in. Crews know one another, generally, by facial recognition. This provision was written in the regulations in order

to enable folks who are designated in the security plan, as designated by the owner/operator to gain -- once they are -- once they check in using a TWIC card -- have one doing biometric match and insure that that TWIC card is valid -- they then are enabled to have recurring access on board that vessel and MARSEC with only facial recognition.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Another important definition is the Passenger Access Area definition. This applies to the passenger vessels and ferries. This is a voluntary provision that recognizes that oftentimes secure areas will be designated as the entire vessel and the passengers would obviously need to have access to those areas in the course of the vessel being the business. So this enables the owner or operator to designate the locations to be called Passenger Access Areas where passengers can come and go without having to present a TWIC card because obviously that's not the intention of the rule. And I just would also if comment that you have employees who work specifically only these Passenger Access Areas a TWIC card would not be required for them either.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1

Next slide. The notice recognizes that the heaviest burden and the application of the TWIC requirements will fall on the owners and operators to insure that the TWIC program, as defined by them, is properly implemented. We also wish in the notice to write the requirements in a performance-based manner in order to not be overly prescriptive, to insure the greatest amount of flexibility to the owner operator, who is better able to determine the best way of applying this than the owner or operator. So, for example, it doesn't prescribe exactly where Access Areas will be, what specific readers would need to be applied, etc. It gives them some basic requirements and then leaves it up to the owner/operator to define what those are.

18

19

20

21

22

But I would also just like to mention one other proposed requirement in the rule that not only would folks who have -- who are required to have access to secure areas unescorted -- to have a TWIC --

also it is proposed that other members such as members of the Area Maritime Security Committee or company Security Officers would also be required to have the TWIC Card as well, and that's because of their likely need to have access to sensitive security and information.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

So, recognizing that the owner/operator is crucial in the implementation of this program, the way that this would be done -- at least in written form -- would be through something called the TWIC It was decided that rather than having Addendum. owners and operators re-submit their facility and vessel security plans for consideration and restart your clock on these, that it would be less burdensome for the owners or operators and also for the folks who view these plans to have it merely as an addendum which would be submitted -- would be tagged on to the existing plan -- and would be kept on the vessel with the existing vessel security plan or at the facility with the facility security plan and then at the end of the five-year period for the original security plan,

that information would be folded in by the owner or operator into the updates of the plan which would then be sent to the Coast Guard and approved and have them start the five-year clock again.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

Next slide please. I'm getting ahead of myself. The submission requirements would be the same as the existing MTSA requirements, mainly that if you are a facility owner, then you would submit your plan to the local Coast Guard or captain or port. you are a vessel owner or operator, that would go to the Coast Guard Maritime Safety Center in Washington. Or if you are an owner/operator for a shell facility, would to the requisite district then qo commander. I also mentioned the Coast Guard now has a system called Home Port. It's a web-based portal that can be used to submit these plans. A couple of important dates on this slide and time lines; you've heard them before in some of the comments, and I'll just bring your attention to them again, that the notice proposes that an owner/operator would have to submit this TWIC Addendum within six months of the date that the notice -- that the final rule is published. And then the second set of dates is that owner/operator would be required to operate under that plan within 12 to 18 months of the date that the final rule is published. And you see a range there of 12 to 18 months, and essentially this hinges on the roll out of the TWIC program in the various ports. So, it's based on when the enrollment has been completed in the port in which the vessel or facility is operating or where it's located.

Next slide. So, owner/operator has some additional responsibilities, and I draw your attention to a table that is reproduced three times in the notice. And essentially it's a three-fold responsibility. You've heard this mentioned by one of the commenters that the TWIC has really a three-fold security measure. And basically the TWIC is something that you have which is the card itself; something that you know, which is your personal identification number; and then something that you are, which is represented by your fingerprint which is biometrically

included on the TWIC card itself. Not all three of
these provisions will be required to be verified and
checked upon each entry by a person. And this table
explains when those will be required. So, for example,
under MARSEC 1, if you are a facility, each time a
person who wishes to gain access unescorted access
to a secure area on that facility, they would have
to present their TWIC card. That TWIC card would have
to be biometrically matched to their fingerprint and
then that card would have to be verified as valid with
the TSA. Now, that would change under something like
MARSEC 3 where that person would have to also input
their personal identification number. Now, there is
some communication that needs to take place with TSA
in this process in order to insure the validity of the
card that is being presented. The frequency of that
check is listed in that table as well. So, under
MARSEC 1 for the facility, it would be weekly. You
would have to make sure that you have a list that is
validated weekly. And if it is MARSEC 3, that would
have to be done daily. And, essentially, there are
three readily identifiable ways in which this can be

done. There may be more, but these three come to mind
immediately. That vessel or facility owner or
operator could download the hot what we call the
hot list or the list of invalidated cards from TSA
on that circuit frequency. There could be a live
connection that could be established between the
equipment that would read the card and the TSA
database so that when somebody puts their card in, it
would be seen as invalid if it were invalid. And then
something else where a facility or vessel may submit
a list of its employees who hold TWIC cards to TSA;
and then, if one of those individual's cards becomes
invalid, TSA would communicate with that owner or
operator and then the proper action will be taken.
Having said that, I think my 10 minutes
are up. And I see some commenters who are eagerly
awaiting their time at the podium. So, thank you.
CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Commander.
Okay, we will begin straight away with the first
gentleman.

## COMMENTS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

RICH SMITH: My name is Rich Smith. I'm General Manager for West Star Marine Services in I am here today in my capacity as the San Francisco. Pacific Region Chairman of the American Waterways Operators, AWO. AWO is the National Trade Association representing the tug boat, tow boat and industry is a vital industry. Our segment America's transportation system. The fleet consists of near 4,000 tug boats and tow boats and over 27,000 barges of all types. Our industry comprises the largest segment, fully 80 percent of the U.S. Flight Fleet, which means that our vessels are American owned and American crewed. And we want the Coast Guard to know that our industry takes security very seriously.

17

18

19

20

21

22

Domestic Mariners are the eyes and ears on the water, and we are fully committed to protecting the security of our nation. However, the development of the TWIC is a mechanism to improve security that we believe is unnecessarily onerous and will, in its

current form, substantially inhibit domestic commerce.

Our industry has not been asked for input in the development of these regulations. As a result, we believe the regulations are impractical for our operations.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

of fundamental Wе have number concerns that I'd like to go through quickly. First, there is no provision for new employees to work while they are waiting to receive their TWIC. The towing industry today continues to face a serious challenge in meeting all of its manpower needs. The projected 60-day waiting period to obtain a TWIC, which I think is optimistic, based upon my renewing my MMD the last time, will impede the ability of companies to bring the mariners into the industry in an efficient manner. Similarly, the time away from the job to travel to a TWIC Enrollment Location and the cost of travel and application fees poses real burdens on individual mariners.

21

22

20

Second, the expenses associated with

purchasing and maintaining biometric readers for every vessel and facility will impose enormous costs on our companies, most of which are small businesses. We believe the cost of \$10,000 a vessel is grossly underestimated since it does not include installation or the updating costs. For our industry, which has been in the forefront of proactive development to Alternative Security Program, and the lower risk profile, we believe this is a completely unreasonable requirement. Our vessel crews are small and know one another. For an unknown person to go unnoticed on board a towing vessel is just not possible.

We have a couple of things that we would like to ask. First, we would like to specifically as for a 90-day extension to the comment period -- at least 90 days. We request more public hearings on the West Coast, including Seattle and San Francisco, and we also ask that you get involved with TSAC -- the Towing Safety Advisory Committee -- to get some input in terms of how this will affect our industry. So, AWO, to sum it up, AWO urges the TSA and

1	the Coast Guard to make sure the TWIC requirements are
2	implemented in an effective, efficient way that does
3	not impose overwhelming burdens on mariners and their
4	employees and subsequently shut down commerce in our
5	ports.
6	
7	Thank you.
8	
9	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
10	
11	JOHN PIGOTT: Good afternoon. My name
12	is John Pigott. I'm the General Manager of Tidewater
13	Bare Lines. We're an inland towing company based in
14	Vancouver, Washington. We employ 250 people, and we
15	operate anywhere from Astoria, Oregon, on the Columbia
16	River, to Lewiston, Idaho, on the Snake River. And I
17	am also on the Board of Directors for AWO and will
18	also stand behind the comments of Rich Smith, the
19	previous speaker.
20	
21	Additionally, I would just like to say
22	that our company has numerous concerns over the TWIC

program. We are wondering why our industry was never consulted over the impacts the program will generate. It seems that the Towing Safety Advisor Committee should have been consulted. This would have moved things along much more quickly. And as a result of that not being done, we feel some extension of this public hearing process should be granted. And I would also second Rich's comments that some additional locations should be established to ease access to these meetings so that more people could attend.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

And we are also struggling to really see the benefit of requiring these TWIC Cards for employees of the inland towing industry. almost every towing company has a long-standing familiarity with its employees. Requiring screening of well-known employees could be done expense, but why would you want to? I mean what additional security benefit would be found confirming the identity of people you already know? It would seem a better allocation of effort and funds to focus on facilities that truly have some serious access issues, rather than on a segment of the Marine Transportation Industry that has none.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

So we have concerns over process, technology, cost benefit impacts on our business. Every penny of additional overhead stresses the prices producers of goods and commodities have to set to remain competitive in a global marketplace. And as the cost to move freight increases, exports decrease.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In conclusion, there is still in my mind many confusing elements of this program that need to be resolved before a final rule should be published. Therefore, would we oppose any implementation of this TWIC program until further study is done, specifically to confirm the risk our industry poses to national security and more public hearings are held with additional opportunities for public comment so that affected parties can develop a better understanding of how this program is going to affect them.

22

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. And just by way of -- if you do have a business card and you wish to drop it, you can drop it right there at the reporter's table. And also, just as a reminder, I know you were out to lunch, but if you could put the cell phones and/or blackberries on silent. Thank you.

STEVE NOTT: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Nott. Last name is spelled N-O-T-T -- not to be confused with Berry Farm. I have been the Facility Security Officer for Long Beach Container Program, which is an 105-acre container terminal located at the Port of Long Beach. In 2006, we will handle 390,000 container moves on and off vessels. We will handle 57,000 on-dock rail containers. We'll have 540,000 annual gate moves, which is around 1,500 a day. And our daily head count for all of our terminal ILWU Workers, our office staff, mechanics will average anywhere between 350 and 450 people each day. That

doesn't count the 1,500 trucks daily coming out of the terminal.

LBTC fully supports the TWIC Program. In fact, we were one of the first terminals in the L.A./Long Beach Ports to be used for the initial prototype TWIC card. And I asked that the next TWIC Credentialing Card System not delay our ability to get workers, employees and truckers in and out of our terminal on a timely basis. Any system and readers that add time to our current access control will delay our entire terminal operations and impede movement of containers.

Additionally, the MPRM incorporates by reference FIPS 201, the Regulation for Access Control, do not reflect the full requirements of FIPS 201. FIPS 201 is too cumbersome for high volume daily access; so, the final regulations must allow an alternate means of providing daily access control. The preamble contains elements that are not included in the proposed regulations. We don't know bow to

1	comment on these issues and feel that they should be
2	either deleted from the preamble or incorporated in
3	the regulations.
4	
5	Thank you.
6	
7	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
8	
9	KENNETH KEANE: Good afternoon. My
10	name is Kenneth Keane, and I am the Director of
11	Maritime Safety and Security for Safety in Stevedoring
12	operating marine facilities in the Ports of Los
13	Angeles, Long Beach and other Ports in the U.S. I am
14	also the industry representative on the AMSC.
15	
16	I have serious concerns regarding the
17	proposed TWIC Regulations and how they would
18	negatively impact port operations, especially in this
19	port complex and ultimately the national economy. For
20	expediency, I will cover brief points and elaborate in
21	correspondence to the docket. First, the TWIC itself

is good, and we should enhance port security. But the

proposed procedures and technology for access control; however, are alarming in their complexity and detachment from reality. The technology and access control requirements, while well intentioned, would ultimately significantly delay or stop the efficient cargo movement if delays caused by system of personnel failure were only minutes per person, which is likely. There are upwards of 20,000 longshoremen working on the west coast; maybe 8,000 to 10,000 in our area and thousands of truckers. All of these people are in different facilities at different times. Truck gate moves are well into the thousands, with drivers lined up for processing early in the morning. These numbers don't include the regular company employees, vendors, shipping, cargo surveyors, agents and various port personnel.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Facilities in this port operate like one massive factory with precision and time critical coordination between each part of the supply chain -- ship, terminal, truck, rail. For example, the weighins and truck operations cause severe road congestion,

delay train operations, block tracks for other cargo moving operations. Labor delays impact all modes of transportation. The consequences rapid, are significant and reach far beyond this port. not hypotheses. It has happened here and more than Losses could be in the billions of dollars a Any component of this precision choreographed system that stalls, delays or fails impacts the entire If labor is delayed, the ship can't supply chain. work. Labor is provided in specified units called gangs with defined numbers and responsibilities, so that if one number is absent, the gang is not required to work until the missing member is replaced. The gang not working the way the ship off-load process may ultimately delay sailing of a vessel and inbound of the next vessel.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Similarly, a trucker that has difficulty with a card reader, regardless of cause, will rapidly cause the truck queue to back up on the city streets in way that will exceed state law limits and facilities will be fined \$250 per truck per hour.

At a container terminal, this could be hundreds of trucks where there are thousands of truck moves a day at a large terminal.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

Our company handles about one and a quarter million tons of steel cargo annually and employs nearly a million man hours of labor on five separate terminals in this port. We accommodate several hundred independently operated trucks daily that load cargo from our docks for delivery to the consignee. We put about 100 longshoremen to work in approximately 30 minutes. That includes clearing them through a security I.D. check, a safety briefing, job assignments on the ship or in the yard. Then they have to pass the security requirements of the vessel. longshoremen have an hour lunch that is typically taken off terminal. Other terminals that cafeterias also have their labor take lunch off terminal from 1,200 to 1,300. That places all the longshoremen at the exit gates at the same time. Under the proposed regulations, the longshoreman would have to swipe a TWIC through a carder with biometrics and possibly an eight digit PIN before work starts. They would have to swipe out at lunch, swipe in again after lunch and swipe out at the end of the day. Following this process and assuming the electronic system works perfectly every time, might add one minute per person — much more if anything fails — like the card, the reader, the PIN, whatever. 100 workers equals 100 minutes. That's more than one and a half hours to get people to work. And this is the best case. How can this not impact commerce?

Given this information, why would anyone decide to test this access control scenario in the busiest port complex in the country? This system should be required to be installed and operated exactly as written in the Coast Guard Headquarters building at Buzzard Point. All military would get TWIC Cards with eight-digit PINs, swipe in and swipe out every time you enter or leave the building. Escort every visitor. You should be required to know the identity of everyone in your building at all times. You should watch for efficiency at 00:07:45

and at 15:30 daily when everybody is trying to get
into a car pool. Do that for a month or two and it if
it fails, the nation and the economy won't miss a
beat. Probably won't even know you did it. But you
certainly won't want to experiment with the commerce
in this port complex. You are well advised to deploy
the card, but leave the access control technology on
a test bench until you're certain it will function
without delay or difficulty.
And the last comment, if I have the
time, this morning you said all the information you're
going to collect with biometrics - well, the VA has
demonstrated extraordinary ineptitude in handling my
personal data. And I am really reluctant to give you
10 fingerprints, all the stuff to positively identify
me, and then have you send it back and forth

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

JANICE MARIE McCLAIN GARNETT: Hello,

electronically all over the country. Be careful.

my name is Janice Marie McClain Garnett, and I'm ar
ILWU Class A Member. On behalf of the union, I stand
here humbly addressing you with these issues on the
I.D. cards. I don't stand here to say that I
understand completely the difference between the I.D.
we are using now and the one that is being implemented
here. I just want to say I thank you, because we
treasure and hold highly safety and security on our
job. But I am also here to stand on behalf of each
and everyone of my brothers and sisters that have had
a mark against them. I can stand here under oath and
tell you gentlemen that I have never been inside a
police car and I don't plan to, and I know people like
that have had a past history of dealing with the
certain issues that we are talking about here
concerning their jobs. And I'm here to say that I
know that so many of these people have changed their
lives and they are taking care of their families, like
I am myself, and they are sole survivors and hard
workers. And for their jobs to be taken from them
behind these issues would totally be criminal and
terrorism.

2

Thank you.

3

4

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

LAWRENCE THIBEAUX: My name is Lawrence Thibeaux, and I'm from the San Francisco area. And one of the concerns we have is privacy of information. The ILWU maintains that privacy and confidentiality of information collected and generated by the TWIC Process is critical. Towards this end, Section 7015(e) includes a specific mandate that "information obtained by the Attorney General or the Secretary under this section may not be made available to the public, including individual employers." Consistent with this requirement, information that is gathered from the use of the card, i.e. when employees enter and leave a port facility must not be shared with employers. The TWIC Program was conceived mandated by Congress to enhance the security of the nation's seaports. For this effort to succeed, it must remain solely focused on the objective and not be

used for any non-security reasons. We will continue to work with the TSA and the Coast Guard to ensure that this issue is addressed in the final Rules.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

And one of the concerns we have is some of the information we just received from -- I believe it's -- Congressman Benny Thompson on the 12 of May where he says -- "I am disturbed by recent revelations that the non-for profit company that was designated to do the data management may be well turning around and sub-contracting this enormous responsibility to a profit entity that is formed with a foreign company." So when we start giving this information to the contractors and they implement the TWIC card, some of the questions we have from our members is -- do the contractors or trusted agents and employees who will collect this information -- are they required to go through a criminal background check? Number two, what penalties for misuse of our data? Are there fines? Jail? Or disqualification of contractors who misuse information? And number three, if an enrollment contractor no longer is involved in the TWIC Program,

what happens to the data that was collected while the contractor was involved in the program? In other words, when there is a change of control, who owns the information once it's given to the contractor or third party? Does it belong to the government or does it belong to the private contractor? So these are some of the issues that our members are concerned about when we start giving fingerprints and other data about our personal information.

Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

JOHN SCHWARTZ: Yes sir, I'd like to take a moment to respond to those comments and the excellent questions. I apologize that in my presentation this morning that perhaps saying particularly a number of workers that are going to be directly affected, I didn't perhaps spend a little more time on the privacy issues. But since you've raised these general questions, I'd like to respond to

First of all, we do have a Privacy Impact them. Assessment for the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that was published along with the publishing of the rule. That's a document that is written in fairly plain English and it explains clearly how all data -- all personal data is captured and handled. This document is available through links on the TSA website. So you might check that. It is also available, I believe, through the docket. It is posted on the docket. the docket is your key to getting additional information. Specific to some of your concerns, did the trusted agents that the contractors will be employing, do they have criminal history record checks requirements? Yes, absolutely. In fact, they will be required to get a TWIC card and meet other conditions before they are allowed to engage in enrolling or collecting any privacy information. And they will have to maintain that status as part contract.

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Number two, violations of personal privacy by contractor personnel -- I am not an

attorney -- but the Privacy Act and other Federal Regulations regarding privacy information that do apply in the case of this program. Now, more specifically, what happens -- how is this personal information handled? And it is handled, I think, in an excellent way. Privacy has been one of the three things that we try to maintain focus on as our objective of the program. Number one, for security; number two, to facilitate commerce; but number, three, through all of this to protect personal privacy.

Number one, when you enroll, this information that is collected, it is bundled into an electronic record. It is encrypted before it is transmitted and it is transmitted to a Department of Homeland Security System that is inside what is called a firewall. So it's inside a government firewall. It is maintained -- its operation -- will be maintained by a contractor; however, this facility will be in a government facility under a government controlled facility and inside a firewall. That will be where this data is received. Once the data is received

inside this government computer system, the data is collected at the enrollment center. Since there is no -- there is hardly any paperwork collected there -- that information is going to be deleted from that local enrollment center and no longer preside there. It's automatically deleted. So that means that the personal information that you have will be contained inside this firewall in the government database. Furthermore, it will be compartmented so that there is not just one bundle of information so that people who need to look at, say, fingerprints will be looking at fingerprints and only linked to a file number; not personal information, vice versa, personal information is stored separately.

Number three, the information in the future when it is transmitted for the different security checks or to print your card, that information also is transmitted in encrypted format. When we print the card that the government facility, even at that government facility, once the card passes the quality control check and is ready for shipment,

that individual data is also forever deleted from that place so that we accumulate the data only in one place and it is stored in an encrypted fashion. I think it is very secure and it must pass the muster of a number of privacy reviews. So in that we do have to collect a great deal of personal information to run this program, it is something we have been very focused on. And if you look at the privacy statement, I think you can use the docket to comment on any of the documents associated with the program and certainly get back to us and let us know if you have any privacy concerns. Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks John.

BILL DeWITT: Good afternoon. My name is Bill DeWitt. I am the Corporate Security Director for SSA Marine. I'm also on the Area Maritime Security Committee in Sector Seattle. And I also represent the National Association of Waterfront Employers. I am the Chairman of the Security Committee. I have a couple of points, and some of

1	them are repeated, however, we are talking about.
2	NAWE supports the outreach program, which we have
3	talked about, and we continue to support that outreach
4	program. It just makes sense that you take your
5	questions and issues to the people that are actually
6	doing it basically the marine terminal operators.
7	
8	Another issue is and this is for SSA
9	SSA is the largest independent terminal operator in
10	the United States. It's based on the west coast, and
11	it additionally is the largest employer of the ILWU.
12	That's our work force. These are the people that we
13	depend upon heavily to do the job the important
14	job.
15	
16	A point that has been repeated and it
17	talks about the preamble, there are issues in the
18	preamble that are not stated in the actual regulation.
19	
20	Another point, MARSEC Level 1, 2 and 3,
21	it discusses that the I.D. card, the TWIC, with the
22	biometric check, scales all the way to a PIN number.

MARSEC Level 1, you need a certain check; 2 is a level increase in security; and 3 a PIN number. In most cases, that PIN number will be the individual's social security number. And if it's not given to them, they won't remember it in the first place. My point is — if the TWIC is valid at a biometric level, why do we need to escalate it at 2 and 3? So we put that forward to you for consideration.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

A point concerning secure areas often a crew departing a vessel is required to do checks at the vessel at the dockside. Must they be escorted? It should be explicit and identifies that they do not because this is their vessel -- oftentimes their own security on board the vessel. We are not -we are very concerned about the technology. Wе believe the technology needs to be tested in a marine TSA has worked very hard over a period environment. of time; however, the actual test beds, we believe, the system will not work, particularly, in the marine environment with heat and dirt and those types of And we would recommend that you extend those

1	tests further; that you also extend I don't want to
2	use the term delay the whole process and phase in
3	the TWIC over a period of time.
4	
5	We are concerned about the database.
6	I'm learning more about it. In conversations with my
7	colleagues, we are not sure how that database works.
8	And I know that you have expressed it on several
9	occasions, but a further explanation is local,
10	regional and national, and we would like to know more
11	about it and who manages it.
12	
13	It was pointed out earlier that the PKI
14	has a three-year life; where the TWIC has five. And
15	I'm just repeating what is there.
16	
17	We also are in support of the Coast
18	Guard being in charge of the TWIC Program and the MPRM
19	talks about TSA moving into our facilities and doing
20	inspections. And that's fine; but this later
21	oversight that we had for marine terminal operators
22	with Customs Border Protection and you know, all of

1	these organizations, we think that the Coast Guard
2	should be the focal point as we move forward.
3	
4	Unescorted access this we see for a
5	short term is going to be a challenge and we ask that
6	you take a look at that again.
7	
8	With that, I would like to thank you
9	very much for this opportunity. And welcome to the
10	west coast. Thank you.
11	
12	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
13	
14	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you Mr.
15	DeWitt. Will mentioned one thing regarding this issue
16	the technical issue of PKI Certificates. The owner
17	of the database does have the latitude to specify the
18	length of time that the certificate is good, and it is
19	something that we are working on. It's one of those
20	things. But we anticipate that the certificate would
21	have a five-year life span and match the card.
22	

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

WILLIAM WALKER: Good afternoon. I am William Walker. I'm the General Manager of Safety and Health and the Corporate Security Office for Marine Terminals Corporation. We are a large contract stevedoring and terminal operating company with east and west coast operations. First, we fully support the comments previously submitted of the National Association of Waterfront Employers and the Pacific Maritime Association.

As we see it, TWIC will have three basic impacts to our facilities. One is to management and approved vendors; secondly to truckers; and thirdly to long shore workers. The key concern to all impact areas -- but particularly for truckers and long shore workers -- is how to implement the technology. This also consists of three elements. First, the TWIC card. This will presumably be managed by the government's vendor and will require cards for our employees, truckers, and long shore workers and card

1	verification hardware at multiple locations at the
2	facilities.
3	
4	Number two, pedestal or in-gate
5	hardware. Hardware will have to be installed at each
6	gate or truck lane pedestal to do the card
7	verification. Our concern is that this will have
8	significant costs for initial purchase and then
9	maintenance. And furthermore, the technology is
10	unproven for the volumes we are dealing with.
11	
12	Data interchange. Obviously, the card
13	scan, biometric verification will have to be bounced
14	off of the government database for driver and employee
15	approval. The number one imperative here is
16	timeliness. If it takes more than a second or two per
17	person to do this, it will have very adverse inter-
18	modal operational and economic consequences as have
19	been alluded to by other speakers.
20	
21	Marine Terminals Corporation and our
22	joint venture partners have participated in the TWIC

Prototype Program and are supportive of the need for screening and proper access controls for our facilities. We would welcome and support another prototype or test phase of the final TWIC to insure it meets both government and industry needs. Once implemented, any failure in the TWIC system would have unacceptable consequences operationally.

8

9

10

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

We will provide written comments in the coming weeks to elaborate on these and other points. Thank you.

12

13

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

KEVIN HAYES: Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Hayes. I'm the Vice President of Safety and Security at Long Beach Container Terminal and also the CSO. I am also a member of the Security Committee of the National Association of Waterfront Workers. First I would like to say that I realize we are commenting regulations that Maritime came out of the on Security Act; Transportation not the Maritime

1	Transportation Anti-Terrorism Act. And I think a lot
2	of us would well to remember that.
3	
4	My comments today are only two, and
5	they are not on any dramatic issues. The first is
6	that the MPRM exempts law enforcement personnel from
7	the TWIC requirement. I think we've left out other
8	emergency personnel. The exemption should be extended
9	to the fire, rescue, hazmat responders because it's
10	impractical and unsafe to have them escorted in the
11	event of an emergency.
12	
13	And secondly, to echo a comment by
14	Mr. DeWitt, since the TWIC Procedures are incorporated
15	into the FSP, I think it would be counterproductive to
16	have the TSA also providing inspection of these
17	documents when the Coast Guard already does an
18	excellent and intense job of verifying all the
19	information in this case.
20	
21	Thank you very much.
22	

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

MICHAEL BRIAN. GOOD alternoon.
Michael Brian, the Port Facility Security Officer for
the Port of Oakland. A couple of comments on 33 CFR.
First of all, the security measures for access
control. With respect to the changes proposed in 33
CFR, 105.255, I believe that scrutiny of the worker
credential does not need to change based on the MARSEC
Level. The card is designed to be secure and is
specifically linked, via the biometric, to the
rightful cardholder. If the biometric reader works
and the card has been validated with the TSA system on
a weekly basis, I see no need to add the requirement
for the worker to remember a PIN. Nor is it necessary
to validate the card as authentic on a daily basis at
the time of check in as is currently proposed at
MARSEC 2 and 3. I realize the FIPS 201 is the
standard being applied, but these additional checks
will provide only a very marginal increase in security
one that is not worth the time, effort and
potential problems that it would create.

The focus on scale security at the different MARSEC Levels should be on the other elements of the facility security plan, as is currently in place, including random checks of vehicles and cargo coming into the terminal, increased surveillance of the perimeter and restricted areas in accordance with previously approved facility security plans.

Therefore, I recommend we take a step back from the rigid conformance with the FIPS 201 standard and delete the requirement for a PIN and consistently validate the cards on a weekly basis throughout the MARSEC Levels. This will allow the employment of a simple secure card that will work in a marine environment and allow quick, secure access without delays.

On system reliability, the draft regulations require the facility owner or operator to have access control systems and equipment, including

card readers in conjunction with TWIC that meet VTSA
approved standards. Hardware such as the card,
biometric readers, and the PIN pad need to be designed
and proven in a maritime environment assuming we do
that PIN pad. If we follow the model that the TSA and
the Coast Guard use when testing explosive detection
technology to screen passengers in commuter ferry
operations in San Francisco Bay last year during Sale
2, there were very controlled prototype tests
conducted which yielded significant results about not
only the performance of the equipment in a wet, windy,
foggy marine environment at Larkspur Landing; but also
the impact on and the recommended number of
processing stations that will be needed. That same
principle should be applied to this program. Complete
testing of a prototype system, underload and small
controlled marine terminals should be a quick phase of
the access control system implementation. Otherwise,
million of dollars may be wasted by port authorities
and facility owner/operators as they rush to install
card and biometric readers to be in compliance with
this deadline. As much as I'd like to see TWIC

	Implemented in the Port of Oakland, I also want to
2	insure that the system we install is reliable and
3	efficient.
4	
5	My last comment is on FSP approval.
6	New Subpart D, 33 CFR, 105.500 and 510, states that
7	owners/operators may opt to resubmit their entire plan
8	with a list of sections amended as the TWIC Amendment
9	Addendum, but once approved, it would carry the same
10	expiration date as it had prior to the amendment. I
11	recommend that if we revise if the revised plan is
12	submitted to the Captain of the Port with a revised
13	facility security assessment, that a new time line
14	should start and the plan should be approved by the
15	Captain of the Port for five years from the date of
16	approval.
17	
18	Thank you.
19	
20	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
21	
22	JOHN COX: Good afternoon. My name is

John Cox. I'm a coordinator for the Seafarers
International Union here in Wilmington, California.
Our union is also the largest licensed maritime union
in North America.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

I would like to comment mostly on the requirements of the TWIC and the requirements of the industry in general. The Coast Guard mandates that when the members reapply for a document, they do a security check and a background check. That background check has gone sometimes even to take up to 18 months to finalize the documentation on this. Case in point, I have one member who has gone for his fifth license reissuance, and the first two issuances, they told him to put information down. The second two, he didn't, and this fifth one he has, but now they want to know why he didn't put information on his last two. And I am sure there are other mitigating circumstances involved, but either the criteria has to be equal and fair for one or you are going to have to amend it so it's easier for everybody involved.

22

Thank you.

3 | CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

GARY BROWN: Good afternoon. My name is Gary Brown. I am the union security liaison for the International Longshoremen's Union. I work and live in Peugeot Sound, Tacoma. I am also a member of the Area Maritime Security Committee up there, as well as several other committees.

I just want to touch on just a couple of quick subjects here on the cost. Since it's the government that is mandating this threat assessment and background checks for port security to fight terrorism, doing the work and presenting the documents to the terminal operators, if that is the case, then why isn't the government absorbing all the costs? And other than that -- to follow up on that -- under the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, PL 108-90, Section 520, directs the TSA to charge a reasonable fee. Nowhere does it require workers to

1	absorb those costs. And we would like to respectfully		
2	ask Congress to lift that appropriations rider.		
3			
4	One other thing is also that if the		
5	you've got to remember one thing is that a lot of		
6	the workers are going to have to absorb take time		
7	off as well as costs to apply for the TWIC Card, as		
8	well as if they run across a snag, then they've also		
9	got to incur the cost of their appeals as well as		
10	their waiver. That's something that has to be taken		
11	into consideration.		
12			
13	And just real quick like, I just kind		
14	of wondered why the five-year where the five-year		
15	expiration came up for the TWIC card because your		
16	passport is good for ten years. And you kind of got		
17	to go through the same background checks for a		
18	passport. And maybe you can take that into		
19	consideration. And instead of the five years, put the		
20	ten years on that.		
21			
22	That's all I have. Thank you for your		

time.

2

1

3 | CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

4

DAVE CONNOLLY: Dave Connolly. Sailors

Union of the Pacific.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Two quick points. It's from 33 CFR, I believe that the language that is now in 46 about the character, habits and life of merchant seaman derives. And that is part of the safety and suitability review that a merchant mariner undergoes. In addition to the TWIC, a merchant mariner will have another safety and suitability review including a criminal record review by the Coast Guard for the longshoremen and the Higher standards is nothing new to us, but what we suggest is that we remove the self-disclosure aspects from the merchant mariner application, renewal, duplicate or original application. the criminal self-disclosure requirement because if we are doing a criminal check for the TWIC and then we're doing another criminal check for the safety and suitability review, the only thing that the criminal review -- I mean a self-disclosure review -- does for us is give us an inaccurate test of character, and it's wrong. People shouldn't be caught in a game of "gotcha" with the Coast Guard or the TSA. Let the criminal record review reveal what it will reveal and then if there is going to be a waiver process, let the mariner present his documentation then. He shouldn't be forced into a self-disclosure issue that -- where memories have faded and there may be problems of the understanding about what the actual criminal record is.

Secondly and finally, I heard the rebuttal to the concerns that we have on privacy, and I recognize that there are firewalls and that there are procedures and that, you know, contractors themselves have security reviews, but you will forgive us if we're a little skeptical. As the gentleman said, the VA lost 26 million records of veterans. We've had databases hacked into at Choice Point and Master Card. They've been -- firewalls do not prevent

access. And so, along with terminal access, we should
consider information access and how that access is
apportioned out. And especially how it is controlled.
And finally on access and databases,
let's make it transparent. It is not clear at all,
although many of the databases are listed in the
rulemaking, it is not clear exactly how they are going
to be used in the threat assessment. Let's spell that
out, and let's also spell out whatever other databases
as it says I think it's 1572, 103 other
databases that you may access. What are those other
databases? Shouldn't we have a right to refuse the
validity of any potential disqualifying information?
Thank you.
CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
CAPTAIN DAVE BOEDER: Captain Dave
Boeder, Masters, Mates and Pilots. I feel kind of
silly coming up here and asking about record keeping.

We discussing such momentous things. I was happy to
hear an explanation where there is restricted areas
and secure areas. Within the record keeping, it
appears that we have to keep track of everybody who is
non-TWIC and unescorted or escorted on a vessel and
the names of who escorted them. And this seems pretty
reasonable when you discuss it in terms of a U.S. port
where conceivably everybody is going to have a TWIC.
We do have ships U.S. ships in foreign trade. I
know it's surprising, but there are still a lot of us
out there. When we go to Africa, Asia, South America,
these people don't TWIC from twinkies. You know. And
are we supposed to be like I hope I've got this
wrong but from the brief reading of it are we
supposed to keep the names of the people who came
aboard, the people who escorted these people who came
aboard into every secure area of the ship when we just
said it's possible that the whole ship could be a
secure area. It doesn't seem very realistic to me.

Thank you.

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

FRED ROZO: Good afternoon. My name is
Fred Rozo. I'm a Certified Entomologist, Technical
Trainer and Security Safety Specialist for Western
Exterminator Company. I'm speaking for the Pest
Management Industry and for the National Pest
Management Association. We've discussed this matter at
fumigation division meetings where these concerns have
been expressed. It is important to note that our
industry supports the protection of our country from
terrorist threats; however, there are certain concerns
that we have in terms of the present program. The HME
and the TWIC Credentialing Process will cost our
industry significant amount of money due to time delay
in getting new hires productive in their jobs and
things related to both credentialing. The official
delays also in new hire and existing employee
productivity could be caused by the appeals and waiver
process when background checks uncover criminal
offenses that don't automatically disqualify someone
from being issued a TWIC or an HME. For instance, you

hire someone who completed the initial background and driver checks and everything comes back clean. At a later date, you move that person into a position requiring either a TWIC or an HME, and uncover a derogatory offense, such as possessing of fireworks, that isn't serious enough that you terminate that employment, but it presents an obstacle in getting credentialed under those Programs. Your only choice is then to appeal and apply for a waiver, which takes time and further delays in moving that individual into the intended position.

The other issue is delays in responding to customers because of problems with access control systems used with the TWIC Program delegate import/export commodities and other shipping problems requiring fumigation and other services that we can provide at the ports could be affected by delays caused by access control system failures caused either by weather, power failures, connectivity, etc.

22 And then the other issue is that this

thing also falls under the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 where the Act addresses actions that may result in the expenditure by a state, local or federal government in the aggregate or by the private sector of \$100 million dollars or more in any one year.

So that's our point. Thank you very much.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

HENRY HERNANDO: Good afternoon. I am Father Henry Hernando, Local Director, Maritime Ministry, Los Angeles, formerly Chaplain, now I'm assigned as Deputy Port Chaplain for Long Beach, Los Angeles and Port Hueneme. What we do in our centers — we have three centers — we are there to provide or facilitate for the spiritual counseling and many times for foreigners — translations. So we also provide, of course, religious services, both in our centers and aboard ships. And we work very closely with the other groups, like the IDF, the Merchant Marines, and some

religious groups that we educate and that we have a very good relationship with because we are trying to provide a good spiritual and moral well being for our sea-faring visitors.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

Not 100 percent of this -- we have this Association -- called the AOS USA. And the president tasked me to voice out these three concerns for the First off, the president asks us to fully AOS USA. comply with the letter and spirit of the IDIS code and the CFRs and Regulations for seafarers' access to shore leave and the ability for visitors to enter the facility or the vessels. We are very concerned. vessels will allow or offer only access to a ship visitor or for whoever is waiting for his or her TWIC. Furthermore, there will be a need for persons or visitors -- the questions is how do we -- how are we able to bring someone in that is still waiting for the TWIC program given that the regulation seem to say that they have escorted access to such visitors and that each person must have a TWIC. There is a vicious circle right here. So that is our concern.

Lastly, AOS USA is a business and they
should have shore leave probations but the high water
taxes or other services at such high and sometimes
outrageous rates we don't believe that this is
complying with the spirit or the letter of the IDIS
code. The effective denial of shore leave and
essential provisions for visitors or counselors will
only continue to be eroded unless the U.S. Coast Guard
will be much softer on this. We are generally
concerned with the human emotional well being of the
sailors who seem to be receiving less concern,
interest and intervention. I have 10 volunteers and
they need to be guaranteed that they will access. And
secondly, of course, that is there anyway for us, the
non-profit organizations, basically giving religious
services to be given a special access under this TWIC
Program? The answer is much appreciated. We hope you
can give attention to this and we hope and pray for
the well being for sailors and the mission and for us
to be an asset for our nation and homeland security
and an asset for worldwide peace. God bless you all.

Thank you for your attention. God bless America.

2

1

3 | CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

LEAL SUNDET: I'm Leal Sundet. I'm

President of ILWU Local 8, which is a Portland, Oregon

Long Shore Local. It would be nice to have this in

Portland, but I understand why it's in Long Beach.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

What I find interesting today is, as I listen to comments far, there so seems to be agreement, if you will, amongst all people that actually work in the trenches in the industry, that we don't think this is going to work very well. the union has gotten up here and talked about it. We're there every day. I can see every single aspect employee group, whether it be operators, Pacific maritime itself, or tug operators, whatever, are saying this isn't going to work the way you guys have it written up. I think you ought to step back and take a look at that, because it's coming from people who are out there every single

day working in the trenches and really know this business. And I think you need to really pay attention to that.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

thing about it, I One just thinking about it, realistically, you are going to have -- you've got hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of longshoremen come to work every single They are going to be missing cards. Cards are day. going to be lost. They are going to be destroyed. Machines aren't going to work. On one vessel alone, you might have 100 people showing up, and they are going to be showing up within 15 minutes of the port start time to go to work and you have to try to figure out how to get them all through the gate. There is going to have to be all kinds of contingency plans. You know what the contingency plans are going to be when things don't work? Open the gates and let them in. That's reality. That's what is going to happen. You got people all over the docks now that aren't even being dealt with under TWIC. Just an example, you've got a lot a largely foreign sailor groups. They get

off the ship and they're on the dock, using the
telephones, whatever, trying to call home. They are
all over the dock. You've got truck drivers that are
all over the dock. We had a meeting in Washington with
Mr. Sand I think the gentleman on the end was there
and they used the hazmat experience. They said
with the hazmat experience, you didn't have a lot of
I will use the word failure I guess for people
who apply under the disqualifying events. I would
submit that the people who applied for hazmat were
those that chose to apply. It wasn't mandatory in a
sense. If you didn't want to have a hazmat
endorsement or you knew ahead of time that you would
have a disqualifier, then you didn't apply. So the
experience, statistics you are getting from hazmat,
are not going to apply when you make it mandatory to
truck drivers. Because in a time, you pay truck
drivers almost nothing the industry pays truck
drivers almost nothing. I guarantee you under the
current disqualifying offenses, you are not going to
have very many truck drivers pass.

Now, one of the concerns under the truck driving or under the disqualifying portion that I am particularly concerned about is TSI. permanent disqualifying whatever -- I am not even sure what a TSI is. It's defined as a Transportation Security Incident. It's a security incident resulting in significant loss of life -- it's not an "and" there it's environmental comma damage, transportation disruption, economic system or disruption in a particular area, as defined by 46 USC 70101. That's extremely broad and could apply to even protests of somebody making just simply a protest in front of an NTSA Facility. So a lot of people are going to get hung up with that.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

The one good thing though -- and I think it should stay in here -- I see a little yellow card out there -- it should stay in there -- this is the first time I've seen it. This is really why I am standing up, because I want to say something positive. I know you haven't heard a lot of that. It's the next sentence. And it says a work stoppage or other non-

violent employee-related action resulting from an employer/employee dispute is not a transportation security concern. I think that's an imperative there. And if for no other reason -- the next time the employers lock out the longshoremen, you wouldn't want them -- you guys can use this to keep them off their own terminals.

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

TOM RUZALA: Good afternoon. My name is I'm the Director of Nautical Operations Tom Ruzala. and the Company Security Officer for the Cruise West which was at one time Alaska Sightseeing. representing any agency, group or affiliation, just one company, one family-owned, American, U.S. flag operational which is going company, to have ramifications if this proposed legislation is passed as is.

20

21

22

Before I go into it, I have a few comments and a couple of concerns, but before I go

into that, I think it's important that I give you a snapshot of Cruise West because after reading through that legislation, after drying up several highlighters and going through my ibuprofen, one thing is very obvious. I don't think TSA or the Coast Guard really has a very good understanding of the small ship industry. Obviously, you have a great understanding of piers, port facilities, terminals, container operations, and deep sea ships; but I think we are so far under the radar, you are missing us. But the impact of these regulations are not.

Cruise West, like I mentioned, is family-owned. We are actually the largest small ship -- overnight -- small ship company in the United States and you can say North America for that too. We have eight small vessels. They are Subchapter K. Less than 100 gross tons each. The length varies anywhere between 90 feet and 214 feet; so you're talking small, dominated by anything that is deep sea. Our crews are approximately 28 to 30 aboard each vessel. We carry anywhere from 70 to 100 passengers

depending on which vessel you're talking about. Five of these vessels are 104 compliant. The other two are not. Facilities that we use -- we do use a few 105 facilities, but most of them are your mom and pop piers. Your little locations that do landings for passengers or take on logistics, whatever the case may be.

Four points that I'd like to touch on.

One is two comments and I don't mean to sound ungrateful, but two comments. Exemptions, the target of this legislation, and two impacts. One is cost and the biggest one, which I haven't heard too much about, is implementation. Exemption -- in the regulations, I found it to be almost at travesty of security logic where every U.S. American citizen that is manning U.S. flag vessel is going through this extensive background checks, and at the same time, foreign vessels with foreign seamen are basically given back door entry and exemption to pier facilities, shore leave and so forth. There's a disconnect in the logic behind that as far as security goes, from what I can see.

The second is the target of the legislation. As I mentioned, the legislation has written -- seems to do a great job in addressing the larger, mega industry, the ports, the facilities; but the smaller industry, it doesn't. I came away after reading the regulations that the way this is being approached is like dragging a bottom trawl through to catch a few lobsters. You'll get the lobsters, but you're going to get everything else in there and what comes up is damage. And we are going to be a damaged company if this goes through as it is.

Cost -- there is discussion about the individual cost of \$139. In our industry, that's impractical. We are primarily a seasonal operator. Our vessels operate six to eight months out of the year; although we have activity around. Six to eight months out of a year. That means from lay up, we go through an extensive hiring phase, interviewing, background checks and then we then get about 240 seamen. The last point I had, and on that point, the

problem is these individuals are not going to pay the \$139. So the company is going to end up paying anywhere from \$40,000 to \$52,000 for the first year of implementation. And \$20,000 to \$26,000 for subsequent years because these crews continually turn over. The crews are made up out of 18 to 22 year olds. They come in; they go. We average actually five mew crew members every week that we have to handle.

And that falls into the fourth point, which is implementation. As it is written, this will not work. It is impossible to hire crews on short notice, get them to vessels within a week to 10 days when you're talking 30 days to 60 days of background checks. It won't work. Will it kill the company? I don't know. I don't think so. Will it cripple us? Yes. So I am asking that you reconsider and possibly consider the fact that maybe vessels that are less than 100 gross tons with undocumented mariners be exempt from these TWIC regulations.

22 | Thank you.

2

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. OLSON: I'm Olson. I'm this area's Labor Representative. I'm on the Area Maritime Security Committee. It's hard to tell on a lot of these issues because so many of them overlap. again, from the hundreds of thousands that concerned with, there are some questions. A little over 50 years ago, during an armed conflict with Korea, my union was protesting background checks. And reviewing that recently, that process included an appeals system with a local board, people familiar with the industry, the operations in the area, including, actually, labor representatives. earth has changed in a half a century to make you offer us something far worse than we got out of Joe McCarthy at his worst? We are in the Kangaroo Court now.

20

Now, another thing that comes up often.

22 || The maritime worker is given the dubious honor of

making an involuntary contribution by all indications right now to the soon to be burgeoning Maritime Security Industry in Kentucky? As a maritime worker who's also somewhat familiar with Kentucky -- I feel obligated to point out that what one might mistake as an ocean there is actually blue grass. And knowing that the current administration has an aversion to knowing what's in certain containers that are designated to be empty, I would like to confirm that we all really do know what is in a pork barrel. Right? Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

MAX VEKICH: My name is Max Vekich.

I'm a Member of ILAU, Local 52, Seattle, Washington.

I would like to thank you gentlemen for being here.

I also -- in all the things that were testified here today on, my union brothers and sisters, it perhaps has not come out clearly that we actually asked after 9-11 that the U.S. Coast Guard be the lead agency in any efforts to improve port security. So, I think

that's important we say that on the record, because we have a long history and confidence that they will do things right and fairly and our information was kept private and secure. It will not be used as a club by any foreign-owned employers to be beat us in labor relations. And so were there on 9-12-01 in D.C. to talk about the issues and put a plan together we thought was approved for security. We've come a long way since then, and we wish you good luck in doing a fair and adequate job. And we are here to be part of the process. And we are glad you are listening.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Wе have а couple of concerns specifically. The ILAU's concern about the certain application of waivers to subjective decisions. are concerned the waiver process and the MPRM does not apply to security threat assessments made by TSA for subjective reasons under Section 1572.107. Under this section, TSA can disqualify someone for criminal offenses that are not on the disqualifying list if the TSA determines that other convictions are extensive; that the conviction is for a serious crime or the

person was in prison for over one year. Putting aside
this very broad and subjective criteria, we don't
understand how TSA is implementing this without
allowing workers to seek waivers. They do it for
other crimes listed in Section 1572.103.
Specifically, Section 7015(c)(2) of the MTSA
specifically mandates that TSA afford a waiver for all
reasons a worker may be disqualified from holding a
transportation security card. We understand that TSA
does not afford waivers under the hazmat Program for
disqualifications for subjective decisions, but we
objected at that time also; but this again, this is
apples and oranges. This isn't hazmat now. This is
the maritime industry. And a Maritime TWIC, it is our
interpretation that a waiver is a statutory right and
that it cannot be denied by TSA at its discretion.
Congress makes laws; agencies implement laws, is our
understanding. We hope and expect that TSA will make
this change in its final version of these rules.

We would also like to add that this is the maybe the left coast and comprised of blue states,

but there hasn't been a terrorist incident involving a union worker in the history of our union, which starts back in 1934. Thank you.

4

5

6

1

2

3

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. I think we have time for two more. Any of the people we don't catch, we will catch at the end of next session.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

7

ROBERT BORGUS: Good afternoon. Му name is Robert Borgus. I've had this Blue Card right here for much too long. In 2004, they sent me for a 20-foot container. I found the container and started going back to the ship and it exploded on me. You know, I don't know if anybody else has ever had this happen to them, and you have to just excuse my stuttering, you know. But I think you guys are going I mean there are a lot of people about this wrong. out there that are doing their jobs, days, nights, whatever. But you know we've got families. I am sure I have you guys love your families. True or not? been in the service too. I did my duty. I didn't come home just to get blown up here. I'm sorry to be so rude, but I'm tired of this. I could have lost my life. I should be dead. I know how the thing feels. I mean it. And you can call me an idiot. I don't care what you call me. But I had to get this out. Because if you guys don't do your jobs right, how can we do our jobs right bringing in your goods?

That's all I got to say. I got to go work.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

Good afternoon. I'm the Director of Maritime Security for Total Terminals International. I'd just like to make one comment on the PIN number that is going to be associated with the PKI Certificate. As an armed forces member, I've been using a CAT Card for about four or five years. Recently, I had to go get my card and my PIN reset because I forgot it. Now, as you heard today through a number of comments of how the impact and how many people come through our facilities

and through our port daily, for me to go through that process to go to another Enrollment Site at DoD to get my card reset, if that is going to be the same process for the TWIC Card if somebody forgets their PIN where they are locked out after three tries, there will be 138 test sites nationwide. Is that going to be sufficient for the amount of workers that are here in the Port of Los Angeles or other ports in the nation?

My proposal is if that's going to be the case where that PIN is going to be required, there be more test sites, they be open 24 hours a day, seven days a week for access for people to go back to get their PIN reset. Furthermore, by doing that, you are also delaying the job site from getting started. You've heard comments from Mr. Keane relating to key individuals about getting the job started at a site that will stop commerce. Please keep that in mind as you're writing these Rules. Thank you.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. Let's take these last two. I think we'll just hold off of

the break.

CAPTAIN RICHARD GOBEN: Thank you for the flexibility. My name is Captain Rich Goben. I'm the Port Captain of Port Loma Cruz in San Diego, also FSO, VSO among the Area Maritime Executive Steering Committee on the Harbor Safety Committee involved in the San Diego Area.

I would just like to reflect on some comments I've already heard from some of the small operators here. We've heard a lot from large companies and unions and truckers and this and that sort of thing, but I'm a small passenger vessel business; and just a few minutes ago, the gentleman who was up here asking you not to forget about us as well, I operate seven vessels down in San Diego, and four of them are regulated vessels. Our facility, to give you an idea, consists of a ticket booth, which is the size of the table you're sitting at and a single dock, which could easily fit length-wise in this room. The dock is entirely visible from the ticket booth.

And one of my comments is -- when the Rules are written and when they are revised, I just want to take into account what the facilities are. For example, if someone has to have escorted or be escorted down to a crew facility, does that mean that a person can't walk down on this dock to repair a fender, so to speak, without having someone take the time out to escort them.

I think the Rules reflect that it would be a burden to the industry to have to do this in every single case. So I think that we need to have a way to mitigate that so that it is realistic for all sizes, not only just large vessels and facilities, but smaller ones as well. The other thing with the card reader on the vessels, a lot of our vessels do have to go to other facilities, so that would mean that the readers would be on the vessels themselves. And at these facilities, often, if we do an event, there are people that do need access to boat earlier in the day, such as musicians, or vendors or even the clients themselves. And the way it is written, it basically

places a burden on us to escort them basically all the time, meaning payroll hours rise. So I am sure you understand it's a big deal in an industry that is not as rich as everyone seems to think.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

4

1

2

3

The second thing I'd like to comment on is the burden on individual mariners. As I said, you've heard from the unions; you've heard from lots of groups of people, but what about the people, like me, that are mariners that are not in the large groups that have to absorb these costs myself -- ourselves anyway -- assuming that no one pays for them? example, to get a license today, you only have to pay for a physical, any license courses. For STCW for the license itself, there is an evaluation, a testing fee, an issuance fee. For an MMD, there is a fee. is a drug-testing fee. There is radar school. There is fire school. All of these are associated costs. And I think that just automatically assuming that \$139 is not going to mean anything to people in the business, I think that's a bad assumption because we are not as rich as we would like to be.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

The other thing about having the TWIC Card affect all mariners on all vessels, all licensed and rated mariners, the thing that comes to mind as a person not only in Kentucky, but a person that say has a six-passenger license, the person that owns their legally takes own small sailboat and out six passengers miles from any regulated facility, vision I have is that this person has to have a TWIC Card to look in the mirror and identify themselves every morning before they come to work. And I am not sure that that is exactly what the intent is.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The other thing that has been mentioned here is some of our workers are temporary. It takes a long process to hire them. We don't have that much time. And especially on some of our vessels, if we have an H-Class Vessel, they are required to be mariners; so they have to get an MMD Card. Now, to have them get a TWIC Card, it is number one, a burden on them or us, especially with the turn around. And number two, it is just the time constraints are

prohibitive.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1

Final thing I'd like to say is just keep in mind, we are all working the same industry here. And I'll go back to prevention for people a few years ago, and I believe -- I don't know if it was Admiral Carr -- but the person that was honored, the mariner, respect experience. Thank you.

9

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

FRANCINE ALVAREZ: Hello. My name is Francine Alvarez. I'm an ILWU Member, and I am also an American. I have just a couple of comments. First, I participated in the TWIC Prototype; and as Ι know, TSA was the one that took information. I want to know -- because I understanding that this Card is just -- it is going to expire. It is not going to be good and it is going to through all over. Where is this have to go information? If it is going to be implemented into the new Card or how is that going to work of those of

us that did participate in the prototype. It would seem like a waste of money to do it twice. Now, I don't know how far they went through into this. I know I signed a paper for background check, and I think they should be able to use that information towards this new one, if anything, to save money — for whoever needs to save money.

The second thing is I had questions regarding the charges or the crimes that people might have if there is -- like they say the appeals process -- but what about expungements. I know under the DRE, like Department of Real Estate and other state organizations, you must disclose something, but if it has been expunged, it's not supposed to be held against you. And if it's been that long that the Judge granted you an expungement, that's another question I have.

The third thing I'd like to comment on is --I'm a third generation ILWU Member. Even prior to the union being formed, when conditions were at their

worst out there in the harbors, as far as I know, there has never been any ILWU worker that had committed an act of terror or anything else on our own bread and butter -- our jobs that we work every day.

5

6

4

1

2

3

Thank you very much.

7

8

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JOHN SCHWARTZ: I will answer the questions about the Prototype Cards. There was a general question and some interest here in the Long Beach Area I am sure. The data that we collected as part of the prototype, the personal data from all of the workers remains in TSA's custody. It has not been destroyed or left our custody. And it remains in the encrypted format. The Cards themselves are -- well, they have expired and serve no more purpose other than to demonstrate that you participated in the prototype test, and we appreciate the fact that you did take the time to help us out and be one of the people who gave us the data upon which we could build our decisions

regarding	this	Rule.
-----------	------	-------

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

Regarding the Prototype Card, there was no criminal history records checked, nor was there any legal status checked. We did run the names against a terrorist database, a name-based check for terrorist database, pretty much the same as the no fly list. So I think that answers -- the cost -- and there was no cost to the Prototype Card to workers. As far as what will happen with the Rule; and in fact, to establish a fair and level playing field, we will have to involve everybody equally whether they participated in the prototype or not. you made your contribution to us to help shape this Rule and give us the information, and we appreciate that very much. Thank you.

17

18

## CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks John.

19

20

21

22

DOUG MONTGOMERY: Hello. My name is Doug Montgomery, and I am with the Harbor Marine Services. We serve the Pacific Rim providing tanker

escorts and ship assists in commerce as well. The requirement here is a card reader on board every It is unnecessary. Our vessel crews are small and usually very familiar with each other. Certainly, if there was a stranger on board, we would be able to identify him because the crews are small. The opportunity for an individual to go overlooked is virtually impossible on board one of our vessels. Also, many vessels in the industry do not have internet or satellite services, nor do they access the most accurate records of the TWIC Card holders. majority of tug vessels do not have access to internet service for extended periods of time. Given that, we wouldn't be able to update our scanners or the card readers on a weekly basis.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

There are currently no provisions to allow the new employees to work while they wait to receive their TWIC. The towing industry continues to face a serious challenge in meeting all of its manpower needs. The extended waiting period to obtain the TWIC is already projected at 60 days and will

impede the ability of companies to bring new mariners into the industry in a quick and efficient manner. This will exacerbate the towing industry's already acute vessel personnel shortage problem. The 60-day wait in itself could be problematic, but the 60-day period has yet to even be shown it can be processed in that time period.

The time away from the job in order to travel to obtain the TWIC enrollment and the cost of travel and the application fees pose a real burden on the individual mariners, and these further delays and costs could well impact the smooth flow of commerce as vessels are unable to sail because sufficient crews are not available. I'd like to make a suggestion -- an alternative procedure -- for newly-hired employees who have completed the initial TWIC Application Process and other companies' internal requirements -- in-house we do a background search as well prior to hiring someone -- after that, we would like to allow such an employee to be placed in service on a vessel perhaps on a probationary basis. This would allow us

1	to hire, train and place in quarters on the vessel
2	during the 60-day waiting period, both addressing our
3	manpower shortage concerns and allowing the new
4	employee to begin earning income. As mentioned prior,
5	all of our crewmembers are U.S. Citizens and this does
6	seem like a reasonable alternative from a security
7	perspective as well.
8	
9	Thank you.
10	
11	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. Okay.
12	We can break. I've got 10 of 3:00 just about. So
13	let's say let's try to start promptly at 3:00
14	o'clock. We've got a lot more to go over. I think we
15	did have a couple of people who didn't get to comment
16	on the first round. So let's star back up at 3:00.
17	Thank you.
18	(WHEREUPON, A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)
19	OVERVIEW: TITLE 46
20	LUKE HARDEN
21	
22	LUKE HARDEN: I would like to provide

you a brief Overview of the information within the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking regarding the Proposed Rulemaking on Consolidation of Merchant Oualification Credentials. This Rule seeks streamline our Merchant Marine Credentialing Program, to minimize requirements and to simplify the program. As part of the streamlining, we are combining the four currently issue credentials we into single qualification document, which we will call the Merchant Mariner Credential. This single document will then carry all the qualifications that a mariner holds, whether it be Master, Life Boat, and STCW or any of the STCW Endorsements. The TWIC then would serve as the identity document for a mariner, removing the need for a Document Card Key to be used as an identity document.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Next slide. As part of the reorganization of such efforts, of Title 46 of Code of Federal Regulations, we revised certain portions of each part and created an entirely new part. Those items listed in red have the most extensive revisions.

Although this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking lengthy, it does not make substantial changes to the Regulation regarding credentialing of Within the new proposed Part 10, which mariners. formerly dealt with officers, we have retained that information which is general in nature as it regarded the credentialing of maritime personnel, whether an officer or a rating -- rating being the term that we will use for those who were formerly considered unlicensed personnel. Additionally, this part will contain all the definitions for the sub-chapter and the medical requirements for those holding Merchant Mariner Credentials.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Part 11, the new part, was developed from those sections within the former Part 10 that dealt specifically with the credentialing of officers. This Part will also contain information regarding the training course and program requirements. We didn't change those requirements. We just moved them consistent with the Officer qualifications.

Part 12 now retains only that information that is specific to the qualification of ratings. Parts 13, 14, and 16 were revised only to insure consistency of the terminology and also to move the definitions to Part 10. Part 15 added a new requirement that each mariner hold a TWIC before he was allowed to serve on board a vessel.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

slide please. Next Our proposed provisions are for the application process and will not revise the current qualification requirements for mariners. Specific changes include each credentialed mariner must hold a TWIC before they apply for a credential, whether original, upgrade or renewal. There will be no need to visit the Regional Examination Centers because fingerprints and proofs of identification will be provided at the TWIC Enrollment Centers and then transmitted to the Coast Guard. This will allow the application process to be completed completely through the mail, removing the requirement for an in-person visit unless the individual requires examination. As you've heard previously, the TSA will

be conducting security threat assessments. The Coast Guard will continue to conduct the Safety Suitability Assessments before issuing Merchant а Credential. However, that check will be conducted based upon the information transmitted by the TSA to the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard will also use the photographic image that the TSA obtains during the enrollment process. The Coast Guard fee structure We will still charge for will remain the same. as well evaluations, examinations, as issuance. However, instead of charging you for the issuance of four different credentials, we will only charge you for the issuance of the one credential we will now The appeal process remains the same. Coast Guard issues you a credential, we will deal with that appeal. And if the TSA issues a credential, then the TSA will handle that appeal.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Next slide please. The Coast Guard will begin issuing the Merchant Mariner Credential 18 months after the TWIC final Rule goes into effect. During that 18-month period, the TWIC will be rolled

out and this will allow all mariners the opportunity to obtain a TWIC before it becomes mandatory for the Merchant Mariner Credential and mandatory for service on board vessels. Mariners are encouraged to obtain the Merchant Mariner Credential as soon as it becomes available, because failing to obtain the TWIC will result in slowing the process to renew or upgrade your credential. We are extremely conscious of the concern of the protection of personal identity information, and this 18-month period also supplies to the Coast Guard and TSA time to establish a secure system for transferring identify information.

Next slide please. As is our routine, when we were revise the requirements of credentials we issue to merchant mariners, we will be providing a five-year phase in period. This period will begin 18 months after the effective date of the final Rule. This will allow us to gradually increase Merchant Mariner Credentials and replace the qualification documents that we currently issue. As a mariner seeks renewal or upgrade of their current license, the

Merchant Mariner Document or Certificate of Registry, we will issue their first Merchant Mariner Credential. This credential will be issued listing all the qualifications they currently hold. The MMC will be valid for a five-year period. Meaning new endorsements for the MMC after the initial issuance will be issued with the same expiration date unless all endorsements are renewed.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Next slide please. The initial TWIC issued to the merchant mariner may be based on the threat assessment that we have previously conducted. This will cover only those individuals who obtain a Merchant Mariner Document after January 3, 2003, and those who obtain the license after January 13, 2006. These dates are based upon the publication revisions to our current Regulations. Those mariners will still have to appear at the TWIC Enrollment Center, but none of the criminal history check will be required. The TWIC that is issued will expire on the same date as the MMD or license that the mariner currently holds. The cost for the TWIC would be

1	issued at a reduced rate, as we previously mentioned.
2	If the mariner opts to undergo the full security
3	threat assessment, they then receive a five-year TWIC.
4	
5	Thank you very much.
6	
7	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thanks Luke. Okay.
8	I'd like to start the comment process. So when you're
9	ready.
10	COMMENTS
11	
12	CAPTAIN DAVID BOEDER: Again, Captain
13	David Boeder. Masters, Mates and Pilots. And in this
14	instance, I am also appearing before you as the South
15	Pacific Regional Vice President of the Council of
16	Master Mariners, a group that has over 2,000 licensed
17	masters who are either retired or active, and are Ship
18	Captains of vessels.
19	
20	We have some questions. The Federal
21	Register was not very clear on how some of the
	Register was not very crear on now some or the

new Rule that I am seeing. Is it going to be a
license to serve as a Master? Before I went to sea,
I had a lot of education and then I was examined by
the Coast Guard. My license says that I have been
examined and found competent to serve as a Master for
unlimited times on any ocean. This is done by the
U.S. Coast Guard. This is probably the most until
I got married and had a family this was the most
important thing in my life. I was a Ship Captain for
13 years. To eliminate a license, which is a license
to serve, goes against hundreds and hundreds of years
of tradition. It can have all sorts of impact with
maritime law that, you know, cannot be determined and
goes to the Courts. So we have a question a
question that is is the MMC going to return the
word license? Are you going to be licensed to serve
as Master. Licensed to serve as Chief Mate. Because
you are a servant of the vessel. And that's very
important to all our members.

Also, we now have a credential and not a license apparently. And it poses a question -- does

a Merchant Marine Credential remain the property of
the holder? What sort of due process is involved for
revocation? To just say that there is no change
well, that could be fine among Coast Guard
Regulations, but again, in other areas of the law,
it's no longer a license. It's a credential, which
may not hold the same value and require the same
extraordinary proceedings that are required. The
Coast Guard has spent a lot of time a lot of effort
determining whether I was competent. I think they
should have to spend a like amount of time to
determine if I am not competent. So what I'm telling
you is especially all the Coast Guard officers here
our license is the same thing as your commission.
When you change it, it's not just a change in paper.
It's just not a qualification. It's a change in
something that is very near and dear to every license
holder, and we hope that you don't just run off and
change this willy-nilly because it's expedient or
because you want to have one card instead of another.
Most licensed officers don't mind carrying an extra
piece of paper.

And I see I have the yellow card; so I will stop there before I get too emotional. But I've got to be very honest with you, this is a big issue for every Officer in the Merchant Marines right now.

CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

Question regarding the MMC, the Merchant Mariner Credential will still specifically say you are a Master. You will still retain your current -- all of your current endorsements. So you know, if you are a Master with all your Title Endorsements, those would still be retained on that document and you would have an Officer Endorsement.

CAPTAIN BOEDER: Would it say licensed?

LUKE HARDEN: As far as the specific format, that hasn't been determined.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ELIZABETH GEDNEY:

Good afternoon.

Beth Gedney with the Passenger Vessel Association. concerns today are -- as it relates to time line and issuance of credentials -- you stated that the TWIC will need to be presented and I have been told by the MMC that you will need to present your TWIC to get in the front door of the REC. I know there have been colorful discussions there, but we have been spending Industry has invested a lot of effort a lot of time. with the Coast Guard to try to speed up the licensing and documentation process. It continues to get slower. And in the recommendations for the Coast Guard to reorganize to a centralized MMC and restructure the REC's, the goal was to speed up the process, not to slow it down. I believe if we have to wait for our TWIC Card to be issued before we can even attempt to apply for a license or renewal, that that is just going add 30 to 60 days to the process. I'm a little bit sensitive on the subject because my last renewal I guess 10 months is relative to took nine months. nine months.

1	I am also concerned that you have
2	written yourself into a corner in terms of your time
3	line that you put up there. The Rulemaking states
4	that implementation will be done in terms of the
5	largest ports first, moving down to the smaller ports.
6	I don't believe it says that mariners will be put to
7	the front of the line. I am concerned mariners will
8	be waiting for their TWIC in the 750,000 that need to
9	be processed and their license will expire or document
10	will expire while waiting for the issuance of their
11	TWIC. So I hope that you will look into some way
12	where the two processes can be conducted concurrently
13	and one won't have to wait for the other.
14	
15	Thank you.
16	
17	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
18	
19	MARC BISSONETTE: Good afternoon. My
20	name is Marc Bissonette, and I am the Director of
21	Marine Operations for Clipper Navigation Incorporated
22	of Seattle, Washington. We're a small business that

been supplying ferry transportation services between various ports between Puget Sound and British Columbia for approximately 20 years. We strongly believe in risk based security measures. We dedicated precious resources, over a half a million dollars, developing our 105 facility, and this includes full coverage, CTTUE, a biometric access system, passenger screening equipment, and we have secured our we've provided vessels, and training for 200 employees. We are also Sub-Chapter H.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

So all of our on-board employees have to have Z-Cards. The expense and the 30 to 45-day -- we are finding that it's 45 days a lot of the time -- to get the Z-Cards is a big burden on us because we deal -- as you've heard from other small vessel operators -- we hire seasonal help, about 60 per season. We also hire about 30 seasonal terminal employees. These are all in the age group of late high school to college employees. We have over 100 percent turnover from year to year in these employees. The terminal employees, I have just been informed,

it's just over 200 percent, which far exceeds the 12 percent that I read. We would like to propose that only employees that have access to restricted areas on board the vessel or in the passenger terminal be required to have a TWIC. Besides the Z-Card, we are a border state, and our employees are going to be required to have a passport also. So we are at the point now where if you add a TWIC to it, our entry-level employee is going to have to have three forms of Federal I.D. That's an entry-level employee.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Surely, there must be some way combine these I.D.s. An entry-level Z-Card does not indicate any proficiency -- any job proficiency -- and it is just a secure I.D. like a TWIC. Could the entry-level MMC employee be eliminated and be combined with a TWIC? Likewise, could TWIC information be embedded into a Passport? If one could imagine usefulness in such а document, especially somebody that lives in border States, if you could have both of those documents in one.

The last 10 years have been a perfect
storm for international ferry operators. Rising fuel
costs, medical costs, and the growing shortage of
qualified workers have a significant impact on us.
And now we are facing a passport requirement, which is
going to significantly reduce the amount of our
potential customers. Add to this a regulatory burden,
which has included pardon the acronyms ISM,
STCW, MTSA, GMBSS, AIS, VDR and the lists goes on. We
are suffering from what I call regulatory exhaustion.
There is a point at which we can't pass these costs
along to our customers. What can we do? Number one,
we can reduce the number of employees, which decreases
our service levels and then also decreases safety and
security on our vessels and in our terminals. We have
the option of out flying our vessels also, and we can
do that and use foreign workers. Is that going to
increase security? I would think not. And then I
guess the last alternative would be to just end the
service altogether, and this is something that all the
international operators are facing here. So when you
do look at those costs, and the costs in slowing down

1	ports. And the economists will tell you that there is
2	a multiplier effect when you take away jobs on the
3	waterfront, it results in a lot of jobs being lost
4	inland.
5	
6	Thank you.
7	
8	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
9	
10	JEFF BROWNING: Good afternoon. Jeff
11	Browning from Sause Brothers Ocean Towing. We are an
12	American family-owned tug-boat operator on the West
13	Coast. We also operate on the East Coast. We support
14	the streamlining of the MMD and the TWIC Card, but we
15	and like many before me would like to see some
16	alternate plan to let people come in. Our industry
17	our manpower shortage I am not very good at numbers
18	here but it's there and there needs to be a way to
19	have mariner come on board without having to wait for
20	a Card.
21	
22	Some of the expenses associated with

this, I have heard a lot of numbers today. I listened to what's going on. We have a medium-size fleet. Tt. is going to cost us somewhere between a million and a million and a half dollars to do this -- to put the I haven't heard much good about the readers on. readers. Tug boats -- everything is outside. Some of our tug boats, the wheel house is about twice the size of this podium. They don't fit well in this Program. There is going to be a lot of problems. I am not saying it's impossible. It's a cost, and it is going to be very hard to implement. Also, I heard about networking issues on that. That will be another cost for us.

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

I also want to echo the regulatory exhaustion. We have been through OPA 90. We've been through -- our company in particular -- RCP, ISM, ISO. Those were voluntary. We had this alternate security plan. I am sure this will fit in with that somehow. But it's going to be a big cost as well.

21

22

20

I would like to recommend that TSA

1	looks at giving us a 90-day extension. This came
2	fast. If you weren't involved in the process, it's
3	hitting us hard, and we are a medium-sized company;
4	but there's a hundredfold tug companies out there like
5	us that probably don't even know about this. And it's
6	going to hit them even harder.
7	
8	We do support AWO's comments as well.
9	Thank you.
10	
11	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
12	
13	DAVID SELGA: Good afternoon. My name
14	is David Selga and I am a Regional Director of the
15	Boston Maritime Company based here in Long Beach. I'm
16	here as a Member of American Waterways Operators, and
17	American Waterway Operators have very serious concerns
18	with two disconcerting provisions of the NPRM on the
19	Merchant Mariner Credentials.
20	
21	Mariners are already required to
22	undergo stringent medical examinations, including

vision and hearing tests. Medical professionals are well aware of the physical requirements needed in order to perform the duties aboard a vessel. However, Section 10.215(b) seems to suggest that a physician must now document the physical ability of the mariner to do his or her job. The implication that a mariner in his or her position must travel to the vessel in order to validate the American physical disabilities is unnecessary, and it is a real burden on both the mariner and the attending physician. Similarly, the medical professional should be able to determine a mariner's ability to perform his or her function without overly constrictive standards. Inclusion of additional hearing standards in Section 10.215(c) is unnecessary. That's with respect to my membership in American Waterways Operators.

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Now, as a local operator, I have a couple of concerns that I would point out and that is our inability to cover the function in our primary mission, which is to assist ships in our port. Under the program, as I've heard, there seems to me that

there is a failure with the lost card, a failed card,
a failed reader. If we are going to be in a
situation, since we have a call-in crew compliment, we
are going to be forced to find a replacement crewman
on the spot, within a matter of 10 to 15 minutes. We
compete with many of the other terminal operators for
essentially the same labor pool, which is a skilled
labor pool, documented labor pool, and I think that's
an unreasonable call. I don't think that's
manageable. I don't think it would be effective, and
I really don't think it would work at all. I think
that as a result of that in the potentially
temporarily prohibitive work opportunity for that
employee, I think ultimately that would result in a
problematic collective bargaining process, wherein an
affected employee would be replaced by somebody else
grievance process probably not going to come to
see the Coast Guard or TSA. So I think that those
costs will ultimately be buried under the ripple
effect of the collective bargaining agreement wherein
employees will fight for whatever they can get to
protect their own families. So I would just offer

1	that while we are here as a unit, calling ourselves
2	the industry, that we need to find a mechanism to
3	maintain a consolidated front to work interactively
4	with you folks to find a solution. To that end, I
5	support the extension of the 90-day comment period to
6	allow the rest of the industry to get up to speed on
7	this issue and to invite their conversation into this
8	serious issue.
9	
10	Thank you.
11	
12	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. If we
12 13	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. If we don't have any more comments on this last Title, then
13	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then
13 14	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to
13 14 15	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to comments on any of the three presentations today. I'd
13 14 15 16	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to comments on any of the three presentations today. I'd like to invite up here first the gentleman who was
13 14 15 16 17	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to comments on any of the three presentations today. I'd like to invite up here first the gentleman who was waiting in line, and we didn't get a chance to hear
13 14 15 16 17	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to comments on any of the three presentations today. I'd like to invite up here first the gentleman who was waiting in line, and we didn't get a chance to hear
13 14 15 16 17 18	don't have any more comments on this last Title, then we would like to open the floor at the microphone to comments on any of the three presentations today. I'd like to invite up here first the gentleman who was waiting in line, and we didn't get a chance to hear from Fred Willis are you still here?

Then have at it. Thanks Fred.

## TITLES 46, 33 AND 49

## FURTHER COMMENTS

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

KATHLEEN HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm Kathleen Hollingsworth. I'm Congress Dana Rohrabacher's District Director. Welcome to the 46th Congressional District where we are gathered here today. Along with the critical infrastructure that are located in the 46th District are the Ports of Los Angeles and Long I work at the interesting juncture where one is academica and theoretical and one is policy and one is boots on the ground come together. I am involved to some extent with one that is tactical in terms of security. One is operational, and one is strategic. sit on the Area Maritime Security Committee reporting to the Captain of the Port. Representing the seat I occupy, is sort of a generic elected official. So I give time to whichever one of the state, local or Federal. It's an odd seat to occupy because most of those elected people have very different views what constitutes on security,

especially in the maritime domain. I would say, however, something as amorphous as security -- what does it look like? How do you know you have it? How do you know you don't have it? Last year, I took the Congressman to Mr. Ruggerio's terminal for a full briefing on what was then the TWIC Prototype. The Congressman spent about three hours on site, and today we find out that the briefing that we had -- the prototype that we studied that day -- does not at all resemble what it is we are looking at today. So now, I have the interesting responsibility to go back to the Congressman, telling him it's not what we saw. It's something very different.

Our concern here is -- and believe me the Congressman is very much in support of security tools and designs so that we know who is where at any given time -- but for the sort of tools that have to be efficient. And I would just offer on his behalf that the most peremptory gap analysis of the information -- whether it's anecdotal or evidential -- that you've heard today -- would yield that what we

have produced in lieu of the prototype that we were
introduced to about a year ago is not at all user
friendly. It appears that what we've come up with now
is something that is system driven rather than people
driven. And I would respectfully ask you to really
take into account the information again whether it
is anecdotal or whether you have been given
quantitative analysis in the written submissions
that you really take it into account. I spent 30
percent of my time on port business, and I think I
know the arena rather well, and many if not most
of the stakeholders. And I have yet to see one issue
that has so united and often conflicted group of
people. You don't find these people voicing a common
frame of reference on many issues, and I almost
astounded here today to hear a choir singing in
unison. It's splendid, to say the least; or perhaps
it's one of the more positive outcomes of our efforts
together today. So on behalf of Congressman on
Rohrabacher. Thank you for your hard work here, to
all of you. It's arduous. We all feel like we spent
the last eight hours on a transatlantic flight in

coach. Thank you.

2

1

3 CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Marc McDonald, again. MARC McDONALD: for Accident and Prevention for Pacific Maritime Association. I just wanted to try to finish up on the comments that I was not able to make this morning, adding a couple of thoughts as I was sitting out in the audience. So if I may -- just as a summary, you've heard a lot of comments today -- and let me say I hope they've helped you to understand our concerns. Certainly, this Rulemaking is complicated elements of underlying laws that by the highlighted today and the adopted FIPS Standard.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

15

While the comment process is clear for us, what is not so clear is our ability to affect the FIPS standard and to get any changes in this standard or regulation. For us, the FIPS Standard is of critical concern as neither the TWIC issuance, nor the access control design, can go forward without our

better understanding of the standard, its application and the requirements. And maybe you can take these comments or questions back.

For TSA, how much flexibility do you feel that you have to deviate from this standard? How flexible do you think NIST will be to modify or amend the standard for commercial, that is non-governmental applications. And thirdly, how many of the supporting NIST Documents will also be included when adopting the FIPS. There are three different documents that are listed in the Regulation; but if you read the FIPS standard, they refer to four other documents that either amend, modify or explain the standard.

Getting back to what I was trying to finish up this morning, the proposed Rules outline \$1,028,000 or one billion in 10-year costs. We think that's low, but it's some big number. The timing of these costs predominantly in the first year of implementation, again because of the TWIC start-up issuance and also the hardware for the access control.

Our facilities are expected to shoulder about 39
percent of these costs, a huge cost. To be sure, we
don't want any false starts that would double the
costs on the software or hardware that, because it
doesn't work or because it becomes prematurely
obsolete. But I want to leave you with this we
stand ready to make the access control systems work
right and efficiently, and we want to do that from day
one. Again, we want to emphasize our full support and
desire to work closely with both the Coast Guard and
TSA implementing this important program in the
national interest.
ml 1

Thank you.

16 CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

My name is Captain Michael Jones. I am the Director of Marine Operations for Midland Expeditions. We have two U.S. flight vessels that operate through Alaska and British Columbia and the West Coast of the United

States. In Mexico, we have two U.S. vessels and we also have some four other vessels for foreign flight that do not come to the United States.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

I'd like to comment on some of the questions that you had. One thing within the document was that the impact study on small businesses wasn't quite completed. So I wanted to add that we are getting estimates on the costs of the readers and getting the cards themselves and sending people who really has to pay for that is really grossly underestimated for small vessels like ourselves. Those two vessels are 152 people and we carry only 60 passengers, 25 in crew. I actually have a 200 percent turnover each year. So I am conflicted because we only hire people for six months in 12 positions that These people -- it is not a career we do that. position -- they come, they work for us and then they go on to something else. So there is quite a bit of a large turnover that may have some ramifications depending upon what we actually define as secure areas versus restricted areas versus whether all the crew

need to have TWICs or not.

I would also like to comment on it that
I think we've done quite a bit actually with the MTSA
and ISPS. I have foreign so I have to do the ISPS
in the way of doing our risk assessment. And I
think it has been wonderful working with the Coast
Guard in identifying our plans and getting those
approved. We are required to do I-9 Forms to make
sure we have U.S. citizens working on our vessels to
begin with. It sounds like there is some redundancy
there. Our crewmembers are required to have passports
because we do go foreign. It seems to be, again,
maybe some things there that maybe you have already
looked into, possibly recreating the wheel on some of
these issues. I know we send in our Notice of Arrivals
and Notice of Departures through Canada, and it will
get back to us within a number of hours sometimes
definitely within 24 hours to let us know through
the background checks that they are using they are
digging up guys that protested the nuclear power plant
back in `79 and they want to talk to them about it.

So in some way, already working through the passport system databases or something else there as somebody else mentioned earlier, it is a 10-year document. Now we've got a five-year, you know, on the TWIC -- they have proposed. You know, maybe we should require all U.S. Citizens to get passports and incorporate your TWIC information and background checks into that. sounds like there is a system already in place and some of the breakdowns in the system -- I don't know how -- you know, maybe it's just a great alias -- Mike Jones -- but I've been on a no-fly list and hassled And I don't really understand it. for years. know, you get to the database -- all right he is cleared -- but something is going wrong with the system there.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

The other thing with this is IT and -even more so on the cutting edge, the leading edge of
technology at the time -- and it is just incredible
costs that are associated with this; so I'd like to
comment on the prototype tests. We have heard a lot
from the other commenters. You know, you really have

1	to have that down pat and tested. Just make sure that
2	it really, really truly is working because it is going
3	to be nothing but a headache for everyone and those
4	costs. Just know we are in here estimated at the
5	head agency in personnel the delays and all that it
6	is going to add to this.
7	
8	Thank you very much for allowing me to
9	comment.
10	
11	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
12	
13	BRENDEN GERRITTY: Good morning. My
14	name is Brenden Gerritty. I am the Southern
15	California Operations Specialist for the California
16	State Lands Commission Marine Facilities Division. We
17	were involved in the prototype tests and we fully see
18	a need and the reasoning behind the TWIC Card.
19	
20	The only comment I have to make is
21	quick. In the Rulemaking, the regulatory community
22	really is not addressed in any way as far as requiring

1	for TWIC Card and not requiring for a TWIC Card. We
2	would just like some clarification on our part to
3	continue doing our job under our mandated operations
4	that we perform all across the State of California.
5	So just some clarification on that part and that's all
6	we need.
7	
8	Thank you very much.
9	
10	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
11	
12	BETH GEDNEY: Beth Gedney, Passenger
13	Vessel Association. And the way I figure it, I got an
14	hour. I can stand up here. I can't believe it's only
15	4:00 o'clock and you guys are wrapping up.
16	
17	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: We expect you to
18	get back in line.
19	
20	BETH GEDNEY: There you go. Every four
21	minutes, I've got to go stand against the wall again.
22	As other presenters today have said, thank you for

coming today. I know we all asked for extra hearings and extra comments and extra time, but this is not an easy process and I appreciate all the hard work that you have done. And I certainly appreciate your listening to my members of the small passenger vessels and taking their comments really seriously.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

I think that we are unique for a number of reasons, and you've heard most of them, but the one I don't think you have heard is I believe we are the only branch of the industry that has had a direct loss of revenue to date from security measures. had customers choose other venues because they don't choose to have their wedding or their Bar Mitzvah on a vessel where there are security measures. a hotel instead. We've been locked out facilities that we have used for years and years, and we have lost very important revenue because of the lack of an available facility. For one of our members to lose a wedding or a big function could be as much as \$25,000 for a one-day function. And to lose that because they are locked out of a facility is very

painful, and I think that makes us very unique today.

I don't know that anybody else has had that experience.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

A number of -- I started with three really simple points this morning that I was going to make and lo and behold as the day goes on, the list got a lot longer. But I'd like to talk to the definition of a secure area for our members, and I certainly appreciate Commander Gautier's clarification for us that a passenger vessel area is not a secure But I think I need to say that that's not area. enough. We need a third area, which is an employee We have places on the vessel where we don't area. want a passenger to go to, but if we found one there, it would not be a transportation security incident. And I think that that's an important distinction. concerned that if it was left as described now -- I know you don't know this happens -- but sometimes the Captain of the Port Zone's interpretation of the Regulations is a little different than it is at And I am worried that the vessel headquarters.

operator is going to say that that's a passenger
access area and the local inspector is going to say
no. The dressing room of the hula dancer or the
galley is not a passenger area; that clearly you don't
let passengers go in there. And again, I stress that
if a passenger were to go in there that it certainly
could lead to a transportation security incident. And
I really think that is the goal as I said I
think the solution for us is either the creation of an
employee area or it's to go back to the concept that
a secure area is exactly the same as a restricted
area. Certainly in the creation of a restricted area,
what we were told to look at was those areas where, if
we were to find someone in there, we could assume that
they were up to no good. It could lead to a TSI. For
most of our vessels, the secure area and the
restricted area would be exactly the same. And I
believe where the conflict is, in spite of what they
said, is that when you pass the point of access
control, you are now in a secure area. And obviously,
for a passenger vessel, access control happens before
the vessel gangway or at the vessel gangway. And

again, when we get into actual advocation, there is no way to separate them as written currently.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

I also think that we have a lot of confusion on what a reader is. I appreciate the comments today, and I was beating myself up why I didn't know what the standard was that everybody was talking about, and I remembered I only had the Rule for two weeks. And the point I want to make is that in the prototype testing -- actually I have a lot of comments on prototype testing -- but one thing that wasn't included were any passenger vessels. fact, excuse me, there were cruise ships -- not small passenger vessels -- and in fact, in the entire rulemaking, I find an absence of reference to the domestic passenger fleet. And I think you need to, in addition, just some of the other things, go back to the assessments, the assumption of turn over -- you've heard some of my members talk to turn over today -costs, economic impact without including the vessels that make up the domestic passenger fleet, you have a false representation of the costs and the impact. And I don't believe any of our vessels are in there. I think there are about 650 small passenger vessels with a security plan, and if you add them into the 3,500 vessels already called out, that is a significant change.

To go back to the reader, up until this morning, I think if you -- certainly I was at the New Jersey hearing -- I had the impression if I asked 10 people what a reader was, I would get 10 different answers. I heard they open gates. I heard that they record entries into secure areas. I heard that they record exits from secure areas. I heard they were tied to a database that collected information and helped with the record keeping. I don't believe the rulemaking intended for any of those things, and I don't believe that the costs called out for a reader at \$2,000 -- \$1,500 to \$2,000 -- certainly doesn't include the database that tracks entry and exit.

And again, none of our vessels -- none of our members -- I don't get the red flag -- I've got

an hour I feel the pain of those who need to go
back and incorporate all these comments, and I think
that the rulemaking reflects a concurrent clearance
process that was rushed. I think they are direct
conflicts and I have three examples. Do you want me
to go to the end of the line and start again? Or can
I keep going? Three examples of where the Rule
contradicts itself within the document and sometimes
within a certain paragraph, it contradicts itself.
One example and I have three is Social Security
Number use. In the 49 section, it says that the
applicant can voluntarily give their Social Security
Number to the person doing their background check.
However, in Part 46, on MMC's, it says that when the
applicant pays with their check or money order, which
are the only two acceptable forms of payment in the
rulemaking, that their Social Security Number will be
written. And it actually spells out that the employee
will write their Security Number on the front of their
form of payment. So I think that's an example of a
direct conflict and causes confusion amongst those of
us in industry. I think access and readers is very

confused amongst those of us in industry. At one point, the rulemaking says that a small company can have one reader, conveniently located. Yet other places in the rulemaking, it implies that there is a reader at every point of access. We certainly hear that in the comments today. But these don't add up. Frequently referenced throughout is \$139 for the fee; yet on page 29430, if you add up the individual fees as called out, and there is a range, it adds up to somewhere between \$155 and \$185 -- a long way from \$139. And you've heard today that mariners can't afford that.

And last, I would encourage -- because I am way past my four minutes -- that you work together with our industry through the ASP. I think the Alternate Security Program was very successful in the implementation of the facility and the vessel plans, and I think it was successful for both you and us. Once again, we are faced with a very short time line, a very short implementation period. The ASP was very successful and helped both of us meet that time

line, not just industry. And while I'd like to say I am going to suggest an alternative to all of the problems that I brought up today, I don't have one. I wasn't able to develop one in the short time that we were given before these hearings commenced, but I think as the ASP's were developed, in a working group between industry and government and Coast Guard, an alternative, if that is appropriate, could be developed in that forum as well.

So thank you for listening again and thank you.

14 || CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.

FRANK PONCE DE LEON: Good afternoon.

My name is Frank Ponce de Leon. I am the current

Secretary/Treasurer of ILWU 13 and today you have

heard a lot from the union's standpoint on the

implementation of TWIC. We were fortunate enough to

be here to talk about the TWIC and the implementation

of the TWIC Card, the technology involved in the

implementation of the TWIC and the major cost factors they see contributing prohibiting implantation on a one shoe fits all type of technology or whether it is going to be some type of individual implementation and different for each facility. But my question to your Panel today is that how realistic is the schedule of the year and a half that you guys projected for the TWIC to impact our work force. And we've got 7,000 registered and about 9,000 casual workers, and we are still growing. And as we continue to grow, what is going to be the ongoing process for the implementation of the first phase of the vetting process and then continue on to TWIC? How is that going to be monitored? What is going to be the responsibility of those that have to submit information as such?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

But again, the feasibility factor of a year and a half, as we stand here today, and we talk about - our employer group talks about costs and what is the cost of -- we're looking at implementation of the TWIC Card as a way to secure the facilities from individuals that are entering and exiting and you

know, going to work and returning home to their
families. However, you guys have been implementing
rules since 2002 that haven't been implemented. And
surely there is no cost to the employer group today.
You heard one of our individual workers come up today
and he was the one that was carrying the container
that had the explosive in it. There was a Rule in
2002, I believe, that was implemented that required
the verification of seals. This container did not
have a seal. It had a lock. That is, it could have
been that incident could have been avoided at all
costs had it been stopped at the gate. There were
about seven other regulations that have been passed in
2002 that we have been asking our employer group to
address. Don't get me wrong. We've come along way
with the ports and some of the other technology that
has been done on the docks. But there are few rules
and regulations that don't cost for the safety of the
individuals working on the docks. And if it is not
TSA and it is not the Coast Guard, then who is the
regulatory agency that is going to be looking at
employers who don't implement rules that have been

passed down since 2002. I am sure glad to see that
Mr. McDonald is in the group because he can show
there has been dialogue with our local labor relations
committees on implementation of those rules. And we
don't have answers today, and we are not going to get
answers tomorrow, and we want to know what we are
going to do about those rules because those rules have
been in place for four years now. You're asking to
implement something within the next 18 months.
Surely, if we can't implement and regulate the Rules
that were passed down four years ago, how can we get
to this next step and insure that, number one, it is
implemented fairly; and that it is implemented
correctly and that we can continue to go to work and
return home to our families after each day. And
that's the major question I pose to you guys.
I appreciate the comments. Thank you.
STEPHEN RYBICKI: Before you sit down,

sir, are you able to expand on the story of the exploding container for those of us who are not familiar with that for the docket?

FRANK PONCE DE LEON: The for the
docket we can submit all of the documentation on
that on that incident. But as far as that, I
wasn't the Secretary/Treasurer at that time. My
understanding of the incident is that number one, it
didn't have a container seal. I have been trying to
obtain the manifest from the facility. It wasn't
we weren't able to get it within five minutes, 10
minutes, one hour, two hours. It took, I believe,
getting the ship to find out exactly what was
contained in that container. Had it been visually
checked at the gate; had it been verified against the
seal, against the manifest, they would have found out
there would have been a problem from the get-go. But
no, that container went through the facility because
Trade Back has implemented the most technology on
behalf of the employer group, and that container went
right through the gate, right into a parking spot and
lo and behold sat there for a few days and got nice
and hot and ripe. And that gentleman you see here

today, picked up that container on his way to the
ship, and it exploded. So you know, again, if we can
get the if we have we had some confusion on the
implementation of the emergency security plan. Some
individuals on the terminal continue to work in
different areas, although there was an explosion. By
the time the word got out to the rest of the facility
that something happened, there was mass confusion on
what was going down. And you know, absent emergency
plans being readily accessible to the workers that
work there everyday, we have even asked to give us the
real Plans and the Lock Out/Tag Out things at each
facility because we have casuals that go to work and
they don't work at the facility every day. If they
had some type of card where they can refer to, not
only do they know the facilities, now they know the
emergency response and what that response would be and
what area you should be reporting to. Who you should
be reporting to and people will be accountable for it.
Those systems don't exist. We are letting you know
from, you know, they are supposed to be there, just
like those regulations from 2002, and we documented it

1	and we have asked for answers, and we don't get any
2	answers. But again, you know, if we are really
3	looking at port security and making it safe for the
4	people that work there everyday, because we are the
5	ones that are the front line for the people, we need
6	to really try to sit down and say okay, yes. These
7	are the things that are going to work. These are how
8	we would like them implemented. And yes, these are
9	the workers that are going to carry out those
10	functions on a daily basis.
11	
12	STEPHEN RYBICKI: Thank you very much.
13	
14	FRANK PONCE DE LEON: Thank you sir.
15	
16	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Okay. We have a
17	few closing comments from the Panel. Oh, I'm sorry.
18	Okay.
19	
20	FRANK NORTH: Frank North, former
21	Junior Local 94 ILWU. As noted by Dana Rohrabacher's
22	assistant, it is an unusual moment when the employers

and their workers have a little moment in heaven
together, we do it for different reasons. Primarily,
the employer, the interest for them is commerce, which
is also in our interest because the more work there is
and the faster it's done and the better it's done, the
more people are employed to do that job. For us, the
interest is, as exemplified in the statutes, it's
about security, and we are all good with security in
regards specifically to the bonds between commerce and
security is understood. There is generally a shared
position between the employers who are known as the
owner/operators and the work force, the ILWU, but our
concerns have more regard for worker protection than
the employers' interests. They always have worker
protection in mind, but their comment have been
generally focused on commerce, maintenance of the
hardware and the way to most efficiently move cargo,
which is what we do. We execute their plan of moving
cargo as best we can. But what is lacking in the
statutes, I am noting that at CFR 1572103,
Disqualifying Criminal Offenses, it was regarding a
TWIC definition of a transportation security incident

and I'm quoting here: "The language concerning the
kind of activity that constitutes a transportation
security incident as required in Safety LU, the
definition now makes it clear that no-violent
labor/management activity is not considered a
disqualifying offense." Moving away from offense and
into the area of commerce, Mr. McDonald happened to
raise the issue about how TWIC will be applied simply
for security and governmental purposes, and I believe
I understood him to say what are the parameters of its
commercial application? And one of the problems we
have right now we have CT Pat. We have ways of
expediting the cargo and some of the transmission of
that information circumvents, we believe, the
collective bargaining agreement, by moving information
past the work force that exists there. And in our
contract, technology that replaces the function of a
worker is legitimate. Now, my question is is it
permissible in the regs to allow the TWIC Card to be
utilized as a payroll spreadsheet? Are there
limitations on the utilization of the TWIC Card in its
application to commercial purposes not related to

1	security. And I hope that the rules as you write them
2	will take that into consideration.
3	
4	Thank you.
5	
6	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
7	
8	MARC McDONALD: Marc McDonald, PMA
9	and I don't know how far afield you want to get I'm
LO	up here to respond to Mr. Rybicki's question regarding
L1	the container. Obviously, we have rules on the TWIC
L2	and the TWIC application and implementation. Other
L3	comments seem to spread that in other ways, and I
L4	don't want to expand this hearing if you don't want to
L5	expand this hearing.
L6	
L7	STEPHEN RYBICKI: The only question I
L8	was asking Marc was if that was the propane tank?
L9	
20	MARC McDONALD: No. The container in
21	question was an outbound container going to the Island
22	of Quadlin. It was loaded with general cargo that was

1	not properly stowed, nor man tested. And it heated
2	up. There was a pick-up truck in there. There were
3	batteries in there. There were butane tanks in there.
4	And it set off an explosion. And there was some
5	difficulty in getting the manifest that was associated
6	with that container so that the responding agencies
7	the Fire Department could make their approach and
8	safely take care of the situation.
9	
10	STEPHEN RYBICKI: Thank you. I do
11	recall the incident. I just wanted to the first
12	gentleman took to the microphone and described it, and
13	I was having trouble connecting the dots about which
14	incident it was. Thank you.
15	
16	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you.
17	
18	BILL DeWITT: My name is Bill DeWitt
19	with SSA Marine and as in Tampa, I wanted to point out
20	another issue with regard to the actual plans,
21	facilities security plans and as we view writing those

plans. SSA is in about 150 locations throughout the

world. And I personally have been involved with
writing and reviewing over 130 plans at various SSA
facilities and partners. In developing those plans,
we took into consideration those specific parts in 101
where you can have alternatives, equivalencies, and
those types of things. In writing those plans, we
also took into consideration those facilities that
were designated as a lesser threat. An example would
be a facility in Portland versus the operations in
L.A. or Long Beach, facilities of lesser consequences,
if you will. In writing the Plans, they are not the
same. And those plans were appropriately identified
as SSI. In developing those plans, those people with
the need to know by definition of SSI will be kept in
that way. We need to continue that way. What causes
a problem or a misunderstanding probably more
appropriate is where an individual or a group of
individuals will pull out the CFR and think that's the
way we are doing business. And that's not necessarily
the case. And as in Tampa, I mentioned that as the
changes are happening with the TWIC and the changes of
33 CFR, as we incorporate the changes in 49 and 46,

1	that those are going to be incorporated in the plans
2	as amendments. It is very difficult sometime for
3	people to understand that it may not specifically
4	reflect what the CFR says. There are alternatives and
5	there are solutions. So, I just wanted to point that
6	out. You know, some people may be of the
7	misunderstanding that that is that that yellow book
8	is the way to do business.
9	
10	Thank you.
11	
12	CAPTAIN BAMBERGER: Thank you. Okay.
13	Anything else? Anybody else? All right. The Panel
14	has some closing remarks.
15	CLOSING REMARKS
16	STEPHEN RYBICKI
17	
18	STEPHEN RYBICKI: Thanks Jim. First
19	off, on behalf of all of my colleagues here on the
20	Panel and Jim Bamberger, our Facilitator today, our
21	Moderator, I want to thank you for your attendance
22	today and the time you took to put to prose, clear,

concise and lucid prose, that I heard. There are some comments that I'd like to reflect upon that I took down that are by no means exhaustive of every single comment that was made at the podium today. There are a few comments that I think are worth repeating. Some of these are issues. Some of them are questions. Some of them are things to take back for the rulemaking, the reg writing team, back in D.C.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Some of them, in no particular order, include the level of access for commercial maritime operations versus Federal Government facilities, a higher level versus a lower level. Request for pilot technology and access controls before a national roll out of the program. A request to use a contactless card that exceeds the FIPS Standards. Ouestions on certifications. Privacy concerns. the PKI comment period for the FIPS 201 is continuing this week. Who is going to enforce these requirements? definitions definition of The of mental а The use of administrative law judges. incapacity. The cost assumptions used in the Notice of Proposed

Rulemaking. An idea for facility staging areas. A
definition for a TSI, a more narrow definition for a
TSI. Provisions for individuals who lose their TWIC
and the ability to continue working while waiting for
a replacement. The use of alternative security plans.
The impact on small vessel operators. Federal
preemption. The extension of the comment period. I
heard a number of people talk about that up to 90
days. I heard others extending it 90 days. Need to
have a published schedule for phase in before we go to
the final Rule. The impact on seasonal cruise
operators. The impact on foreign technical workers
with visas, and the ability for those people to come
and go. Provisions for new employees to work while
waiting initially waiting for their TWIC. There is
a continuing shortage of qualified personnel.
Additional public meetings, I heard today, Seattle and
San Francisco were two that I heard. Engagement with
the TSAC and some other Coast Guard advisory
committees. Questions on technology and costs. Delay
in the access controls for facilities. Delay in the
access control for facilities what will the impact

be? Swiping out on a TWIC card while exiting the
facility. Prototypes should be used at Coast Guard
Headquarters before developed in the ports. I took
particular mention that it didn't mention TSA, thank
you. Contractors that misuse data and the chain of
custody. Privacy concerns, specifically on 70105(e).
Additional outreach efforts. Questions on the
database. The technology is not proven in the
maritime environment and at what point do you agree
that it's ready for prime time? Should we have
another pilot before we roll out? It kind of rolls in
together. The exemption of law enforcement officials
now should lead to all emergencies workers. The
pilot, again, on the TSA, the Sail 2 that was held up
in San Francisco and the patent after the Sail 2
pilot. The removal of a criminal self-disclosure
report. A list of all the databases that will be used
to check for TWIC during the TWIC application
process. A record keeping of U.S. flag vessels in
foreign trade. The need to keep records for all
visitors and escorts. The availability of grant
funding. The unfunded mandates of 1995 as we exceed

the \$100 million that has been reached. The impact on
seafarers' shore leave. The provisions for non-profit
organizations and port chaplains. Experience in the
Hazardous Material endorsements is voluntary and TWIC
will be mandatory. The possible exemptions for small
vessels. Appeals a lock out after three ties on a
PIN. Escorts for small vessels. Escorts of people on
small vessels. The Coast Guard's preventions for
people initiative. The use of expungements or non-use
of expungements. The time lost to get a card. The
impact on the business and on the employee. Questions
about the wording in the document for a license the
word license. And that's particular to me because I
have a license and I would like to see it continue.
I want the record to reflect that is my comment
personally. The costs. The regulatory exhaustion.
The medical requirements for mariners. The impact on
collective bargaining agreements. The difference
between is proposed during the prototype. The impact
on small business. The loss of income on small vessel
operators due to the extra security measures. The
possibility of adding employee areas. The impact on

the small domestic passenger fleet. I think the question was about 650 vessels and that they are MTSA regulated and they are included in the count. The use of Social Security Numbers. The alignment of fees be estimates used by the TWIC on commercial. The one size fits all approach. And those are some of the highlights. I have other pages.

I have a few comments I'd like to make. Some housekeeping things first. The Power Point you saw today is in the docket. You can -- if you really want to see it -- there was a difference. We posted four of them for each city so you will be able to see that we are keeping it -- we didn't change it from city to city. The docket is currently open until July 6th. There has been a request for an extension. I am not -- we are taking that into consideration. When people make comments to the docket in writing, as I said this morning, the idea is to put in specific examples, including the time, materials, costs, wages, lost opportunity and the like. That would go a long way to help the people that are actually reviewing

this. Questions or comments like -- I don't like it -- it's not going to be good -- although they are nice to read, they are not going to add value to the overall.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

The court reporter is collecting the business cards with the correct spelling of your names, the commenters. The transcript will be posted to the docket within a week or in about a week. we are going to consider all of the information we received. And as Captain Sturm started this morning with -- we don't give any particular added or less emphasis to people that make oral statements than what is in writing. We appreciate the passion, thoughtfulness of the comments that were made today, and we really appreciate you taking the time out of your day and coming to spend some time with us. behalf of the entire Panel up here, I thank you again for coming today and look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you again.

21

22

4:50 P.M.)

(WHEREUPON, THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT