

Subject: Ocean Ranger Program

Hi Senator Revak

I wanted to contact you about the Ocean Ranger Program. I watched the hearing the other day and thought it might be good to give my perspective. I was (until recently) a lifelong Alaska, graduating from West High in 2000 and going to sea shortly after. When I wasn't on a ship or attending training, I always came back to Alaska. In 2012 I started working summers as an Ocean Ranger until the end of the program for a total of 8 years. In 2020 my fiancé and I moved to Washington for her job.

As I saw from the presentation, ADEC has done a good job gathering relevant data about wastewater discharge and how the levels in the water changed without the cruise ships which may reduce the impact Ocean Rangers make in that regard. However, having Ocean Rangers onboard benefits the state in many other ways, whether it was exhaust gas scrubber discharge findings, preventing paint spilling in the water (that was common), paint chips going in the water, and plastic getting in the food waste discharge.

I spent a lot of time thinking about how much of a difference the Ocean Ranger program made on the industries behavior - after all you can't prove the bad things that *didn't* happen because we were there - and the best evidence I could find is that when the Court Appointed Monitor Carnival had a team of Auditors that would fly in and aboard a ship unannounced they found a lot of environmental violations in the rest of the world, but almost none in Alaska, besides a notorious event in Glacier Bay National Park. The reports were made public due to public record requests at Carnival's federal trial in Florida. I searched them and could find hardly anything regarding Alaska, and they were on vessels in Alaska numerous times that I knew of.

One recurrent problem I find in the maritime industry is that people sitting in the corporate office write internal policies and procedures requiring shipboard personnel to perform various (daily, weekly, monthly) inspections, PMs, etc. for the shipboard personnel with no regard to whether the vessel has the labor resources to actually complete the tasks, or whether they should be performed at all. It makes people feel good to write overburdensome policies, and no one ever gets fired for writing *too* much. Some companies are worse than others when it comes to this stuff, but from my experience it tends to be a problem throughout the industry. Often times the onboard crew learn to just ignore most of the company policies, because if everything is a priority nothing is, and clearly the people at corporate don't actually care or they would be more discriminate with what they "require". Having an Ocean Ranger come on board to ride the vessel helps the crew prioritize following Alaska's environmental laws, many of which are unique to the state.

As Ocean Rangers we were paired with the Environmental Officers on the ships, and I had many of them tell me over the years that the fact we were coming on board helped give them much more influence with the Chief Engineer and Captain, who are above the Environmental Officer in the command structure. I was told often the senior officers would be dismissive of the

Environmental Officer's concerns, when the ship was operating in other parts of the world, and as the calendar was getting closer in the year to the Alaska season that would start to change, as everyone knew Ocean Rangers would be coming on board, and it wouldn't just be the Environmental Officer disagreeing with them about something.

I also heard a lot of talk about automation, and whether the \$1 rebate would add up to enough to encourage installation of the systems. In certain cases, the money may help justify the cost of a new installation, but many of the ships already have this technology installed (my guess would be 50% of the vessels, give or take maybe up to 20% either way) and it would basically be a matter of either storing and transferring the data, or giving real time access through some version of a remote log in. My bet would be that the majority of vessels that give access are the ones that already have this remote monitoring capability because then it is a matter of figuring that part out. Many of the newer ships have the remote monitoring for some of the engineering systems because when you are doing a new installation the cost to add it isn't much more, whereas doing a retrofit basically you are paying for a whole new system. But just being able to see if a valve is indicating open doesn't really tell you about the numerous other overboard discharges, whether the valve is actually physically open, or any other sources of pollution. The wastewater discharge is just one of many overboard discharge pipes on the vessel.

I will write additional testimony, but feel free to call me anytime, or ask for any information through email. I would be happy to try to help or better explain things if you are curious about anything.

I appreciate all the work you have done over the last few years; I have been following Alaska politics closely the last few years and I see how hard of a job it has been for the legislature and the staffs with the budget shortfalls and low oil prices.

Chris Schneider
907-830-1462