### VOLUME 17

### STATE OF ALASKA

### IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AT ANCHORAGE

-P35 238 296 217-19

SPEC COLL

4 In the Matter of:

STATE OF ALASKA

Case No. 3ANS89-7217

versus

Case No. 3ANS89-7218

JOSEPH J. HAŻELWOOD

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

7

5

6

1

2

Anchorage, Alaska

February 23, 1990

The above-entitled matter came on for trial by jury before the Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, commencing at 8:34 a.m. on February 23, 1990. This transcript was prepared from tapes recorded by the Court.

### APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the State:

BRENT COLE, Esq.

MARY ANN HENRY, Esq.

Assistant District Attorneys

On behalf of the Defendant:

DICK L. MADSON, Esq.

MICHAEL CHALOS, Esq.

MIKE RUSSO, Esq.

24

25

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.
Professional Transcription Service
(202) 347-5395

**ARLIS** 

Alaska Resources
Library & Information Services
Anchorage Alaska

# CONTENIS

W	Ι	Ţ	Ν	Ε	S	S	Ε	S	:

STATE	DIRECT	<u>CROSS</u>	REDIRECT	RECROSS
Michael J. Fox.	7	8	40	
Joseph P. LeBeau	41	85		
John Byers	91	97		
George K Greiner Ir	aa			

1	,	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	
2	COURT'S	IDENTIFICATION	IN EVIDENCE
3	Number 4	6	
4	Number 5	119	
5	STATE'S		
6	Number 28	(withdrawn, page 164)	
7	Number 103		136
8	Number 105		45
9	Number 111		77
10	Number 112		74
11	Number 113		74
12	Number 114		74
13	Number 115	. <del></del>	74
14	Number 116	~~	74
15	Number 118		82
16	Number 120	96	154
17	Number 121	96	154
18	Number 122	118	
19	Number 123	118	
20	Number 124	118	
21	Number 125	118	154
22	Number 126	118	154
23	Number 127	118	154
24	Number 128	118	154
25	Number 129	118	154
	Number 130	118	154

## EXHIBITS (Cont'd)

2	STATE'S	<u>IDENTIFICATION</u>	IN EVIDENCE
3	Number 131	118	154
4	Number 132	118	154
5	Number 133	118	154
6	Number 134	118	154
7	Number 135	118	154
8	Number 136	118	154
9	Number 137	118	154
10	Number 138	118	154
11	Number 139	118	154
12	Number 140	118	154
13	Number 141	118	154
14	Number 142	118	154
15	Number 143	118	154
16	Number 144	118	154
17	Number 145	118	154
18	Number 146	118	154
19	Number 147	118	154
20	Number 148	118	154
21	Number 149	118	154
22	Number 150	118	154
23	Number 151	121	
24	Number 152	.121	
<b>2</b> 5	Number 153	121	
	Number 154	127	129

### PROCEEDINGS

(Tape No. C-3637)

THE CLERK: -- Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, presiding, is now in session.

THE COURT: We resume Trooper Fox's testimony. You're still under oath, sir.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, at this time, I was going to be playing the tape, and I was going to request that a transcript be provided to the jury. Would you like a court exhibit on the transcript?

THE COURT: Yes. Have it marked for identification.

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I would object to the passing out of a transcript. It seems to me the tape is quite clear. It's audible, and I don't know what possible assistance a transcript might have, and it could have errors in it, and it is likely to confuse rather than help or assist the jury. So (inaudible).

THE COURT: The testimony was that there have been a couple of errors, and I'll give the same instruction to the jury I did with the other transcript. Your objection is overruled.

Ladies and gentlemen, Miss Henry will pass you a transcript, and when you're finished with it, return it to the front counter. The instruction I give you for this

, 6

וו

transcript are similar to the ones I gave you for the earlier transcript.

The transcript is not evidence. It's what you hear is evidence. If there's any deviation between what you hear, any variance between what you hear and what you read, disregard what you read. If what you hear, for example, is unintelligible but there's a word for it on the transcript, disregard that word, even though it would seemingly explain what you hear. It's what you hear is the evidence, and not what you read.

You may pass them.

(Pause)

This is going to be Court's Exhibit Number 4, Mr. Madson, for the record.

(Court's Exhibit 4 was marked for identification.)

MS. HENRY: May I proceed with playing the tape, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

(Pause)

Has the tape been admitted in evidence?

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I thought I had moved yesterday for it. If I did not, I would move it at this time. It's Exhibit 102.

MR.

(Inaudible).

```
MS. HENRY: I do _____. It's in evidence as
1
2
   Exhibit 102.
3
              MR.
                            : Well, it is (inaudible).
              THE COURT: Is it? All right.
              Before you play it --
5
              (The following was had at the bench:)
6
              THE COURT: Yes, sir. Is there any dispute that
7
   where it says JH that it will be Joseph Hazelwood
8
   throughout? Is there a genuine dispute about that?
              MR. MADSON: Oh, I don't believe so.
10
             THE COURT: All right.
11
             (The following was had in open court:)
12
13
   Whereupon.
                           MICHAEL J. FOX
14
   recalled as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska,
15
   and having been previously duly sworn by the Clerk, was
16
   further examined and testified as follows:
17
                    DIRECT EXAMINATION -- Resumed
18
              (Tape played)
19
              (Inaudible)
20
             MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I have some concern that
21
   they won't be able to hear it. Perhaps we should put it
22
   back to the witness stand tape (inaudible).
23
              THE COURT: Well, you can take the microphone off
24
   of --
25
```

Honor.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to emphasize my instructions at this time. It's what you hear is evidence. What you read on that document is not evidence, so keep that in mind as you listen to this tape, and wherever you can listen and not read, make the best effort to listen and not read.

(A tape recording was played in open court.)

MS. HENRY: I have no further questions, Your

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MADSON:

- Q Trooper Fox -- it is Trooper Fox, is it not?
- A Yes.
- Q And your name is Michael J. Fox?
- A Correct.
- Q Well, sir, let's go back to the past for awhile if we can here, and I'll ask you some questions about March 23rd. And I think you said on your direct examination that you had gotten in quite late from Cordova, and obviously went right to bed.
- A No. I arrived on the ferry at about 10:30 at the dock. Hitched a ride home from a guy that was on the ferry there, and I actually walked in the door at about 11:00.
  - Q What time did you go to bed then?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 25

on fire, or they lost power and drifted ashore, or something like that, that they're aground because of something, and he never had a because of something. So I asked him --

- Q So you didn't know any reason.
- A Right.
- Q Right.

A So I asked him to repeat it several times, to try to get a better picture of what he was telling me.

- Q He called you because you're on a list of people to call --
  - A A notification list.
  - Q A what?
  - A A notification list.
  - Q What is that notification list?
  - A I don't know. It's their list.
  - Q It's the Coast Guard's list?
  - A Yes.
- Q So you just know that -- was it you or -- well, they didn't call you because you're -- it was Michael Fox, State Trooper, it's because you were kind of standing in for Mr. Alexander, the other trooper. Is that right?

A On that call, I'm not sure if they called me because I was the Division Official Wild Life, or if it was because of the state troopers. I knew that Trooper

1 2

Alexander was out of town, so I knew I was the only public safety person there, so I knew that I should pass it down through the public safety command, which is the trooper at dispatch.

Q Well, I guess what I'm trying to get at is they may have called you because you're in the fish and wild life part of the state troopers as opposed to the law enforcement part, right?

A May have.

Q But at that time, no matter what, they weren't asking for your assistance as a law enforcement officer.

They were just telling you what happened?

A They were just telling me, yes.

Q And you evidently, after the call was completed, did you try to go back to sleep, or did you go back to sleep?

A Well, I called them right back again, and asked were there a public safety hazard? Was there a fire? Was there a risk of injury to anybody? The village of Chachiklek is nearby there, and I'd have to be concerned if there was a fire or something headed towards that village, or — you know, it seemed like a pretty big event, and I ought to find out a little bit more of the details.

Q I guess so you didn't find any more details?

A No. They said everything is pretty normal. It's

9

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

just hard aground, leaking oil.

Q Hard aground, leaking oil, and that's all that was known?

- A That was it.
- Q So did you then go back to bed?

A Well, I was still in bed. My phone's right there by the bed.

- Q So it was about two hours later then, about 4:30, when the second call came from Mr. Peterson?
  - A Right.
  - Q Again, Mr. Peterson?

A Well, I believe it was -- I can't say for sure, but I think Mr. Peterson kind of got me on the line and sort of held me for Commander McCall. And I don't think Commander McCall actually dialed me right up, but I -- Commander McCall passed the message to me.

- Q So then you spoke directly with McCall?
- A I believe so.
- Q And -- now, you didn't take any notes of that conversation at 4:30 in the morning, I presume?
  - A No. Not right then, no.
- Q Can you say for sure that Commander McCall did not ask you at that time to get some blood test -- blood kits or something out to the Exxon Valdez?
  - A No, he didn't say to bring a blood testing kit.

Q Well, you were informed, were you not, that somehow there was something said that there was supposed to be a drunk captain on board the Exxon Valdez. That's the message that you got?

A They wanted a trooper out there right now, yeah.

Q You subsequently learned that this message got garbled somehow between whoever sent it from the Exxon Valdez to the Coast Guard station, to McCall, to you -- because that isn't what happened, right?

A I'm not sure what the question is --

Q Well --

A -- but when I got to the bridge, Falkenstein asked me, "Where's the blood sampling stuff?" and I didn't know what he was talking about.

Q That's my question. So, somehow, if he made that request, back to the shore, to the VTC Center, and McCall got on the phone and called you, somehow that message didn't get through, right?

A I would say yes, yeah.

Q Because you said in your direct examination that you got the examination that there was a drunk captain that you had to go help subdue.

A Right.

Q Now, did McCall ask you anything about a portable breathalizer, or anything like that?

23

25

- A No.
- Q A breath test kit?

A No. Before I left, I called the police department and told them that I may be bringing some people in for alcohol sampling, to be ready, because I was under the impression that I would get the people, take them off the tanker, bring them into town, where we would go through a normal drunk driving thing.

- Q When you say "them," were you talking about more than one you were going to bring back now, or at this time, or --
  - A Well, whoever, you know.
  - Q Okay.
  - A But one or more, whatever.
- Q Your understanding, your state of mind at that time was that there was one individual that you had to go and physically subdue?
  - A Right.
  - Q Right?
  - A Right.
- Q And you felt that the Tom had called, the Tom that relayed the message, was not Tom Falkenstein?
- A I thought it was Tom McCarty of the DEC -- who was not even there.
  - Q Who's not where?

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

. 21

22

23

24

25

A He wasn't on the boat.

Q You didn't know that.

A No. I thought when they said "Tom" they meant Tom of the DEC, not Tom of the Coast Guard.

Q Did that strike you at all strange that Tom McCarty, I think you said his name was, would be calling you for this assistance?

A Well, actually, that made the most sense to me, because the DEC people are responsible for oil spill pollution in the state of Alaska, and they go to every oil spill that there is at the terminal, and Tom McCarty would be the senior person when Dan Lawn is out of town, which I thought he was still out of town, as he was on the previous oil spill over at the terminal a few weeks before that.

So when they told me Tom needed help with this problem, I thought he meant Tom of the DEC. I never imagined that the Coast Guard couldn't handle that problem.

- Q The Coast Guard couldn't handle the problem themselves, right?
  - A Right.
  - Q And had to call you in.
- A I would have been surprised if the Coast Guard was asking for me, yeah.
  - Q Yeah.

And as far as you know, Tom -- well, I'll get to

**⊸**25

that point, but in any event, then, you must have got up, got dressed, put your uniform on, right?

- A Right.
- Q Side arm?
- A Yeah.
- Q Weapon.
- A Right.
- Q How about some kind of club or something, to, you know --
  - A No, I had --
  - Q -- knock folks on the head?
- A I had my uniform, my gun, my handcuffs and my notebook.
  - Q And your what?
- A My notebook. That was it. I had left my truck at the airport when I flew to Cordova. I got in on the ferry, which is several miles from the airport, so I came directly home, and in my truck is my stick and my cameras and all those things.
  - Q So you didn't take your stick or camera?
- A No, I thought it would be -- from the way they were talking to me, I figured it would be best just to get there as quick as I could and not worry about the other stuff, the time it would take me to recover that.
  - Q I take it you must have had some thoughts going

through your mind at this time, like, "This is no way to start a morning," or something, you know, going out there to \_\_\_\_\_ arresting somebody. 3 4 Α Well, I was surprised that the ship was there, 5 yeah. Yeah. Q 6 7 That was very unusual, yeah. And unusual for you to be going out this far to 8 have to subdue somebody, or --10 Α Oh, not that so much. We go to the village, we 11 go to the -- we -- I've driven to Glen Allen in the middle of the night with cold weather, my head out the window, trying to stay awake. I've done all kinds of crazy calls that --14 Q So this was no crazier than normal? 15 Α Well, it's just another one. 16 17 (Laughter) 18 Q Anyway, you got out there, right? 19 Α Yeah. I think you said you got a boat, so he took you 20 Q up to the --21 22 Α Coast Guard boat, yes. Were they waiting for you when you got there? Q 23 Yes. Α 24 So they -- somebody was expecting you to come to Q 25

11

12

. 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the dock there, right?

A A couple of the crew members and myself actually pulled in the parking lot right at the same time, and there was a couple of more guys already on the boat, and we just kind of took right off.

Q Did you have any conversation with them to say, you know, what's going on? You know, what's happening?

A No. It was pretty obvious they didn't know much either.

Q So you got out to the ship, the Exxon Valdez.

You explained that it was difficult getting up there
because the oil on the starboard side, you had to go round
the port side, right?

A Exactly.

Q And got up the ladder, went to the bridge, and lo and behold, there was no ranting and raving drunk up there, right?

A Right.

Q And did you see Falkenstein and Delozier up there?

A Yes.

Q And you said, well, you know, "What do you want?"

A Yeah. I was ready to go, and nothing was there.

Q And nothing was there. And the atmosphere was very subdued and very quiet, depressing?

cause." That means you have to some kind of reasonable

25

belief that a person has committed a crime, and you can then arrest him?

A Sure.

Q Yeah. And if it's a drunk driving, or something like that, you have to have some observable things to look at --

- A Some evidence, yeah.
- Q -- in that individual, right?
- A Right.
- Q And from what you learned, you didn't have that?

A I didn't feel I had enough, and the Coast Guard said that they didn't, neither. They said they could take blood samples just because of the accident. And I said, "Well," -- I asked them, I said, "Are you a hundred percent sure that you can legally do this? Otherwise, I will go through the State's avenues. I will launch an investigation right here and now, and we'll do it the state way, search warrant --

Q What is the state way?

A Well, a search warrant, for one thing, to get the captain up and get some blood out of him. And that type of investigation. But I said, "Are you a hundred percent sure that you can take blood out of these guys?" And they said, "Yes, we can." And I said, "Well, fine, let's do it."

Q So you were agreeable to help do it the Coast

21

22

23

24

-25

Guard way --

A Right.

Q -- because that was the most expedient, and that's what they wanted, right?

A Right.

Q And you were certainly there to assist them any way you could, as a state --

A Right.

Q Well, in that respect, did you tell them that you knew of people right there in Valdez that you could get on board to draw the blood because you couldn't?

A Sure. We talked about how we were going to get it

Q Did you tell them individuals, or, I mean, who you could use?

A Well, they would run off to the phone -- one of the Coast Guard guys would go to the phone and talk to the office and try to get somebody out there, yeah.

- Q And this was 7:00 o'clock or thereabouts?
- A Yeah. It started right away.
- Q And right away, you informed him. "Hey, I know people we can get out here."

A Sure. We all knew that. We all lived there, and we know there's three doctors and nurses and EMT-3s. We --

Q Did they tell you, then, why they didn't want to

use the people you suggested?

- A No, but I kept asking them.
- Q But they never told you?
- A No, they didn't -- they'd go back to the phone and talk on the phone some more, and come back.
- Q Did you feel that you were maybe getting a little ignored at this point?
- A Well, it was their investigation, so you kind of do the best you can.
- Q Yeah, and in doing that, you are trying to offer services that appear to be not accepted?
- A Well, you reach a point where, if it's their thing, then they've got to do it, and there's no sense, you know, getting into any kind of argument, or fighting about it. I knew they were trying to get somebody out there, and I knew I told them all that I could tell them, and it's just time to let them do their job.
- Q So anyway, did they tell you why, then, that they didn't want to take anybody onto the boat, to shore, to have the breath test done in Valdez?
  - MS. HENRY: Objection. Hearsay.
  - MR. MADSON: What grounds?
  - MS. HENRY: Hearsay.
- MR. MADSON: Well, Your Honor, on direct, he's gone into every conversation with every person on this

7

8.

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

vessel. I think I can certainly, since the door is open, ask him the same questions about who he's talking to and what was said.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I would also say that it isn't for the purpose of the truth of what was said, but simply to show what this person, this gentleman, did as a result of the conversation.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

- Q Then, Trooper Fox, after having conversation with them, and evidently these people did not come out from the shore that you suggested, right?
  - A A Coast Guard medic came out.
  - Q And when did he arrive?
- A I don't know when he arrived. They told me arrived -- it was after Gregory Cousins' interview I found out he was there. He had arrived and had started doing his sampling before I even knew he was there.
- Q Well, you've got like the three hours here from the time you got on board and this was discussed until then. What did you do in this three-hour period?
- A Well, we -- the first block of time, we just sort of decided what we were going to do. And then we moved on to the interviews of Mr. Kagan, and then I had a brief

Q Okay. And that was the time you saw him in the passageway?

A Well, it was either on the bridge or right outside the bridge in the companionway.

- Q And were you with anybody at the time?
- A There were other people around, yeah.
- Q Do you remember who else was there?
- A No, I can't say.
- Q Now, you said at that time you kind of came up and said, "Gee" -- you introduced yourself at that time?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q Said who you were, and you were there helping them, and with the state investigation, right? And you said something like, "Well, you know, what's the problem?"
  - A Yeah.
- Q And he said, "Well, you're looking at it."

  Right? Did he gesture at all with his hands, or did he just stand there when he made this comment?
  - A I can't remember that.
- Q Trooper Fox, as you indicated earlier when you got there, the situation was pretty obvious. There was a ship hard aground on a reef with oil coming out of it, right?
  - A Right.
  - Q Would you say that the comment, "You're looking

at it," may have been one that was designed, or spoken to communicate with you that the problem is obvious, you're looking at it?

A No, because --

MS. HENRY: Objection. Speculation.

THE COURT: Don't answer the question.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

- Q Well, you don't know what was in the captain's mind when he said that, right?
  - A No. I don't know what was in his mind.
- Q After you -- where were you going when you say you met him in the entryway?

A I believe we were going to find Gregory Cousins, to interview him.

- Q The interview sequence, or who was going to be interviewed first, was determined by the Coast Guard and not yourself, right?
  - A Yes, Mark Delozier.
- Q You told Mr. Delozier that you would certainly want to be present, or wanted to be present to assist in interviews?
- A I sort of asked him, you know, "Would you like me to be there, help you form questions," you know, listen.
  - Q Did he indicate one way or the other?
  - A He said, sure, yeah.

Α

Just like that, yes.

vessel, and that -- the interview was actually over and we were talking about what we were going to do as far as securing the other ship alongside it, and I was going to get a helicopter to fly back to town, that sort of thing.

So the interview actually ended in the transcript before the last page, you can see where --

Q On that last point, you said you were getting a helicopter, you had access to a helicopter to come out to the shore, to the ship?

A Well, while we were there, and this lightering and all that were taking place, the oil companies, I assume it was, began bringing out big sections of pipe, and people, you know, workers and stuff, so there were helicopters starting to come and go sometime around noon, I'd guess. And it was — they were coming out full and going back empty, so I just rode back —

Q Okay, but it wasn't until noon or thereabouts when they started coming, you say?

A It was after -- it was later in the day. I couldn't tell you what time. But there was quite a bit of activity on the deck there, helicopters and equipment and stuff.

Q What I was getting at was if you had access to a helicopter, say, when you first got on board, if you wanted to take somebody back for a breath test, or something like

that. Did you have access to a helicopter at that time?

A None had been there yet, I don't think. I don't know. But I'm sure, if I would have wanted to, I would have gotten one.

Q Getting back to your short meeting with Captain Hazelwood in the passageway about 8:30 --

A Yes.

Q -- when you spoke to him, that conversation confirmed your original suspicion, did it not, that there was no probable cause to arrest Captain Hazelwood for being intoxicated.

A Yes.

Q You saw no signs of intoxication?

A No.

Q Now, when you -- the tape that you made here is interrupted a couple of times, or interrupted at least once, about somebody (inaudible) and things like that. Do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Captain Hazelwood was still in command of the ship, was he not?

A Yes.

Q No one told you that he'd been relieved, or anything like that?

A It was obvious he was still the captain.

captain's desk and he did the sampling, and he had a urine

sample there from her, and then he was packing it up -they come in a styrofoam pack about this big, with a seal
that goes around it.

And when he was done with her, I was watching how he was doing it, because I knew it would be evidence. And he put a sticker, a label around — a seal around the package, and signed it and dated it and put the time on there, and I couldn't see what he was writing on there, so I went over and I said, "How are you doing this? Are you following good procedure here to secure this as evidence?" And he showed me what he was doing, and I said, "Okay, have you done that to all of them?" And he said, "Yeah." And I said, "Okay, that looks real good."

Q So you were making sure that, for state purposes, this evidence was going to be sealed and taken care of properly, right?

A I made sure that it was not a haphazard operation.

Q I guess I may have missed it, but were you actually present, then, at any time when Captain Hazelwood's blood was drawn, or urine sample was taken?

A I didn't see -- I just saw the girl get sampled.

Q Did you also talk to Delozier or Falkenstein about how they -- what method they were using, or how they were taking care of the samples?

**-2**5

A I asked them, "What happened to the samples?"

And they said, "The medic would take them back," and the medic was already gone then. So he had already taken them back.

Q You wanted to find out where they were going or what they were going to do with them?

A Well, it's just a basic rule of investigation. You keep track of evidence, yeah.

Q Because you might want to use it again later, right?

A No, it was to secure the integrity of it.

Q Yeah, but I mean you might want to have access to it later to find out where it's going, what they're going to do with it, right?

A I don't really understand the question.

Q Well, I guess what I'm saying is, what good would it do to know how they're taking care of it, if you don't ever want to see it again, or be involved with it again?

A Well, I knew it was going to be an issue again. So you'd want it to be a valid issue, or a valid piece of evidence.

Q Have you done this before as a state trooper -taken blood samples -- not personally taken the sample, but
had them done?

A Once.

Q But you returned to the ship on April the --

A 2nd.

Q 2nd. What was the purpose of going out there on April 2nd?

A My assignment was to search for documents that could have been destroyed or thrown away in the trash, and alcohol containers, or alcohol — evidence of alcohol use in the captain's suite and in the garbage and the trash. And then there was other people, they were looking at the navigation equipment and the vessel logs and the whole — a whole series of things that I wasn't involved with.

Q Well, let's see. I'm trying to do a little calculation here, and I may be a little long, but it looks like this is a week plus two days, nine days later, after the --

A Well, it was April 2nd, whenever that was, however many days --

Q So it was at least a week later, right?

A Yes.

Q And you have no idea who'd been on board, or who had done what, in that time?

A Well, there's a lot of people on board.

Q Yeah, that's right, and you don't know what happened on that vessel when you weren't there? Who was throwing trash away, or who was doing anything, right?

Q

25

Well, were there some empty bottles that you took

1

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

On April 2nd, they asked them to count up and save empty bottles of Moussy, or whatever, and we did that. But I didn't --

How many empty bottles did you find?

Boy, there was a lot of them. I don't remember. I'll just take a guess at over a hundred.

Q A hundred empty Moussy bottles. Did you save all of them

Α Yeah, we gave them -- the District Attorney wanted them, so we gave them to him.

Do you know where they are now?

No, I -- we didn't want to save them. He did.

Were you familiar at all with this Moussy beer, prior to the time you took the full bottles?

Never heard of it. Α

So you don't know what classification the state of Alaska may consider it, whether it's alcoholic or nonalcoholic?

Don't know about it.

While you were on the Exxon Valdez, did -- you were there, certainly the captain's quarters, right?

Α Right.

As you come out of his quarters, now, into the passageway, is there a door that leads directly to a deck?

A You come out of his room, and it's right on a very narrow companionway. You turn left forward, in a companionway that goes up through a door and up some stairs to the bridge, and that same companionway has other halls and quarters off of it. Directly across from it is the radio officer's room --

Q But my question is --

A And I don't really know if there's a -- it's an in -- it's not a bulkhead companionway. It's inside the ship. So any door would have to be on another companionway.

Q So you don't know if there's a door directly out of his quarters that goes right on to a deck?

A There's a window in there, but I didn't look outside of his window.

- Q Well, if you don't know, sir. You know, I don't need you to speculate. You're just saying you don't know, right?
  - A In his room?
- Q No, no, no. As you leave the room, \_\_\_\_\_.

  Into the companionway. Out of -- out of his quarters.
  - A You're in a companionway.
- Q If there's a door, a door at that point that leads directly outside?
  - A No, there isn't. The companionway is inboard of

the bulkhead of the ship, like an inner companionway, so there couldn't be a companionway, so there couldn't be a door right there to the outside, because it's inside the ship.

Q Okay. I don't believe I have any other questions. Thank you.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. HENRY:

- Q Trooper Fox, the first time you saw Captain Hazelwood and you indicated that you saw no signs of impairment, what time was that?
  - A The first time I saw him?
  - Q Yes.
  - A 8:30.
  - Q In the morning?
  - A Yes.
    - MS. HENRY: I have no other questions.
    - MR. MADSON: I have no other questions.
    - THE COURT: May the witness be excused?
    - MR. MADSON: I would think so, yes, Your Honor.
    - MS. HENRY: Yes, Your Honor.
    - THE COURT: You're excused.
    - THE WITNESS: Thank you.
      - MS. HENRY: The State will call Joe LeBeau.

(Pause)

Whereupon,

2

1

JOSEPH LE BEAU

3 4

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full name, and spell your last name?

8

7

THE WITNESS: My name is Joseph Paul LeBeau.

9

Last name is spelled L-e capital B as in boy -e-a-u.

10

THE CLERK: And your current mailing address,

11

sir?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: The work address is care of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Post Office Box 871064, Wasilla, Alaska, 99687.

THE CLERK: And your current occupation, sir?

THE WITNESS: I'm employed by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation as an Environmental Field Officer.

THE COURT: Ms. Henry, we'll be taking a break around 10:00 o'clock, so you might --

> MS. HENRY: All right. Thank you, Your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. HENRY:

Mr. LeBeau, how long have you worked for the Department of Environmental Conservation?

4:30 in the morning from the office. I went by -- back -- went to the office and collected some equipment to take to Valdez, and I took Mr. McKean with me, as well. And --

Q Who's he?

A Mr. McKean is an Environmental Field Officer who works for the Department in Wasilla, and we went to Valdez at that time.

Q Did you drive, or did you fly?

A We drove by state vehicle. We left at 4:30 and arrived at about ten minutes after 9:00 in Valdez.

Q Sir, as part of your -- when you got to Valdez at some point, did you actually board the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes. I believe I -- we flew out by float plane from Valdez with Valdez Aero Services. I boarded the Exxon Valdez, I believe at around 11:30 in the morning.

Q Now as part of your responsibilities, did you assist other investigators in seizing documents on the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes, I did.

Q And in particular, did you assist a state trooper, Trooper Dial (PH), in seizing some documents?

A Yes, I did.

Q Sir, I'm showing you what's been marked as
Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 105 for identification. Would
you please identify that exhibit?

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Conservation track or monitor the movement of the oil in Prince William Sound?

Α Yes, we did.

And can you tell us the method in which you did that?

We flew out and overflew the oil, marked on Yes. the chart, drew on the chart, the nautical chart, the location of the oil, and then returned -- that chart was returned to the Environmental Conservation Office in Valdez. Subsequently there was a map produced of the -maps -- the charts had been digitized on a digitizing tablet and then stored in the computer. The information that was draw on the charts was then also transferred into the computer, and the computer produced some oil spill tracking maps.

There were different individuals who flew the flights, and each individual who flew the flight had an individual chart or map to -- on which they could draw the location of the oil for the oil spill tracking.

And, weather permitting, did you try to fly every day, or twice a day?

The Department tried to fly as often as possible, when it was safe to do so.

Now, for the first couple of days, did you only Q use one plane?

A I -- I'm not sure about the first couple of days. I knew that the first day we only had a few aircraft in the area. The -- I spent the first two days, I believe, on the oil tanker.

Q All right. Now, specifically, a plane would fly over the spill, and there would be someone other than the pilot that would be actually looking at the spill?

A Yes. There could be as many as three people in the aircraft. On March 24th there was the pilot, Mr. Lockwood, Mr. Sotner, and myself in the aircraft.

Q And who are Mr. Lockwood land Mr. Sotner?

A Mr. Lockwood is an Environmental Field Officer with the Department of Environmental Conservation. Mr. Sotner is also an Environmental Field Officer with the Department of Environmental Conservation.

Q And then one of you would have, what, a navigation chart?

A Yes.

Q And what exactly would happen?

A We would go ahead and draw the location of the oil onto the navigational chart, and then that navigation chart would be brought back to Valdez and entered into the computer system.

Q Did the person who was drawing on these charts try to distinguish between heavy oil, sheen --

Α

Yes, they were.

"We're not talking."

We talked to Mr. Chalos. We've attempted to contact some of their experts. Mr. Chalos told Mr. Adams yesterday to quit calling their experts.

I can quote you a conversation that Mr. Madson had, apparently with the newspaper yesterday, which says that he has found an expert working — who says the work of the NTSB is nonsense. He is quoted as saying, "I don't want to tell anybody yet in case we have to use them as an expert. I don't want the State contacting him," and that's a direct quote out of the newspaper.

I know Mr. Madson knows what the criminal rules in Alaska are. They're found in criminal rule 16. He's been an attorney in this state for many years. I'm not sure how they do things in New York, but in Alaska --

THE COURT: Let's not be namecalling, now, Mr.

MR. COLE: Well, all I'm saying, Judge, is that --

THE COURT: Let's just stick with the request you have.

MR. COLE: The request is that they turn over the numbers of the people, and that they not be directing their people not to talk with us. I mean, if they make that decision, but under our rules, an attorney cannot tell

another person not to talk with the other side.

6.

MR. MADSON: Well let me respond to my part of it, which is quite limited. First of all, I didn't write the, "We're not talking," on there, but I don't think we ought to get into squabbles like that.

Your Honor, we're not talking fact witnesses here. We're talking retained witnesses that we paid for. We have every right, in that situation, to have these people say, "Look. We retained you; we may or not use you in this case; we don't know yet. So, therefore, we don't want you talking to the other side." It's like a civil case.

There's no difference between a civil and a criminal case. Retained expert witnesses in a civil case are never talking with the other side, unless there's a deposition.

I've been doing that for years, and I've never had this concern before, that -- we may get a request, is it okay to have a conversation, but most of the time what happens is you get into this kind of a situation. You're not there. It's a telephone conversation with a person representing your opponent, and then they come into court, and they say, "Mr. Expert, I had a conversation with you, and didn't you admit such-and-such?" And he says, "No, I didn't." And there you are.

. \_25

Now, if we're going to ever have one of these type of conversations, naturally we're going to be present, and I think there should be a recording, and things like that. But to have your opponent simply call the other -- your retained experts to find out what they're going to say is not under the rules. It's not necessary, and that's simply our position.

MR. CHALOS: Judge, what I would like to add to that, if I recall correctly, you ordered us at the beginning of this trial to turn over expert reports to Mr. Cole. We expeditiously turned over to him two very, very thick reports, complete reports, with backup material, with pictures, with explanations.

All we've gotten from Mr. Cole are summaries prepared by Mr. Adams saying that I spoke to this expert and he says the ship was sunk in an hour-and-a-half. Then they give us two pieces of paper in support of that, but no backup material, and that's only come within the last few days. We've given our reports almost three weeks ago, Your Honor.

So I think Mr. Cole is not being fair in his description of what's going on here, insofar as the experts are concerned.

I might add also that Mr. Adams, when he speaks to our experts, or he attempted to speak to our experts,

was very heavyhanded with them. He said to them, "What business do you have coming to Alaska to testify?" Now, I don't think that's proper. And that's the point we're trying to make.

THE COURT: Well, I hope we can take a little higher road than what I hear.

Do you have any summaries or reports of the experts whose telephone numbers you're not disclosing?

MR. CHALOS: No, Your Honor. Whatever reports we had we turned over to Mr. Cole immediately after you told us to -- as a matter of fact, we didn't even have the reports when you ordered us to turn them over. But we hurried up, had the experts put it together, and gave it to them.

Now, the -- the report on the computer simulation expert is a thick report, and then it's accompanied by data that's about an inch thick, backup data. That's the way a proper expert report is presented.

Mr. Cole has given us two sheets of paper from a naval architect who supposedly did very, very complicated, and very sophisticated computer analysis of the stability of this vessel. All we have is two pieces of paper showing us graphs and charts. Ridiculous stuff.

THE COURT: Mr. Madson, did you make that quote in the paper that was read?

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

MR. CHALOS: No, Your Honor. I made that quote.

MR. MADSON: No. wait a minute. Which one are you talking --

(Laughter)

MR. CHALOS: Oh, sorry. Hey. I thought you meant on the piece of paper.

THE COURT: Okay. You made the quote, "We're not talking." Now, Mr. Madson, did you make the quote in the newspaper?

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, the newspaper guy called me and he said, "Well, what's going on with this voice thing?" And I told him, I says, "I think it's nonsense. did not talk to this expert myself but one of our people did," and he says, "Well, do you have his name?" And I says, "No. I don't want you to have it, and I don't want it to get to the State because we're going to have to use him."

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MADSON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I'm ordering you to produce the expert's name, address and telephone number to Mr. Cole. If you have received anything from him in writing, I want you to -- Mr. Russo?

MR. RUSSO: I have some information on --

THE COURT: That's fine. You're interrupting me,

MR. PUSSO: Sorry.

THE COURT: Mr. Madson, produce the name, address and telephone number to Mr. Cole of the person you were referring to when you made that statement, an expert who's name you don't want to disclose, and if you received anything in writing from him whatsoever, I want you to produce it to me for in camera review. I'll determine whether or not it constitutes a report, or any kind of a test. I'll let you know before I release it to Mr. Cole, so you can place your objection on the record.

However, it sounds to me like you have made a statement here that you may intend to use this witness, and so under the Criminal Rule 16, I'm ordering you to produce that information.

If you have telephone numbers and addresses of witnesses which you intend on using, I'm ordering you, Mr. Chalos, to disclose that to -- I'm talking about expert witnesses that are covered by Rule 16 -- I'm ordering you to disclose that information to Mr. Cole.

If your experts don't want to talk to Mr. Cole, I suppose that's up to them. However, I will call your attention to the canons of professional conduct, and I think there are quite a few cases that address what happens to an attorney who specifically instructs a witness not to

} ;

talk. I don't know if that pertains to criminal defense attorneys or not; it may not. However, you might want to review that, just in case.

I do order you to produce the names, addresses and telephone numbers to those witnesses that you might be calling in this case -- expert witnesses only, that are covered by Rule 16.

If you have any reports, or any kind of summaries that have been given to you, or any kind of test results that have been given to you, whether they are in a summary form, whether they are in a written form, or they have been told to you that you wrote down, I want you to produce those to Mr. Cole.

This is not pretrial discovery anymore. This is trial, and we're doing this to avoid a legitimate request for a continuance by the State that might occur if they're surprised, when they didn't need to be surprised.

The State has the same rights at this stage of the proceeding as you do.

MR. CHALOS: Well, it seems, Judge, if I may say, with all due respect, that this has been a one-way road. We're asked to produce and provide, and have done so, as far as the reports are concerned, to Mr. Cole. He's had access to these reports for three weeks now.

We get piecemeal information, insofar as their

Ģ

experts are concerned. So really, if we're going to balance the scale, I think the same ruling should go out to Mr. Cole.

THE COURT: Absolutely. It should. The State should know that, because you have much greater discovery rights than the State does in criminal proceedings. If you have any indication that there's been an abuse by the State of this, you can call it to my attention. I will issue orders to remedy those abuses.

MR. CHALOS: Well, I'll tell you what the abuse has been. I'm convinced that there has been an instruction by the State to their experts not to prepare reports. I'm thoroughly convinced. Because, in these type of matters, the type of reports that would be generated by their experts would be a full report with backup material. All we're getting are just two pieces of paper for all these experts.

THE COURT: Which experts are you referring to?

MR. CHALOS: I'm referring to Mr. Greiner, who is

a -- I don't know what kind of an expert he is, but Mr.

Greiner. I'm referring to Mr. Vorus. I'm referring to Mr.

Milweed, who, by the way, we haven't received, except for a one-page statement, haven't received a single stitch of evidence, or charts or graphs, or discussion as to what he's going to testify to.

THE COURT: How long have you had that?

MR. CHALOS: Oh, I guess since we've filed the notice of experts. But that's true also of our experts.

THE COURT: How long have you had that? I don't know when that date was.

MR. CHALOS: Let's say three weeks, four weeks.

THE COURT: And you have three pieces of paper? What are those three pieces of paper?

MR. CHALOS: I'll show you.

This is supposed to be a sophisticated analysis of a naval architect who's been working on this for, I don't know, four, five months. This is it.

(Pause)

There's no way to tell what he bases his assumptions on, what values he used, what he considered, what he didn't consider.

THE COURT: This document says memorandum. It has one page typewritten, which indicates what Mr. Vorus would — his opinion would be that the vessel had capsized and sunk sometime between an hour, and hour-and-a-half after \_\_\_\_\_\_, after Captain Hazelwood \_\_\_\_\_ successful in his attempts at removing the vessel from the rocks. There are some computer simulations, and then there are some predictions on the Exxon Valdez grounding.

I find that satisfies the rule.

Now, what about -- what's the next one? Mill? MR. CHALOS: Milwee. 3 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Milwee? MR. CHALOS: Milwee. M-i-l-w-e-e. THE COURT: Do you have his name and address. MR. CHALOS: I have his name and address. THE COURT: How long have you had this? MR. CHALOS: The same time that the State has had 8 9 our experts' name and addresses. 10 THE COURT: Can you be a little more specific? I don't know that date, either. 11 MR. CHALOS: About three to four weeks. 12 THE COURT: All right. Now, what is it, what 13 have you got from the State regarding his? 14 MR. CHALOS: We got a -- as best as I can 15 remember, because I don't have his file with me, it was a one-page summary. 17 THE COURT: A summary of his testimony, or what 18 he would say? Or his test, or what? MR. CHALOS: I don't think it was a summary of 20 his testimony, just some background and just some things 21 that he said, and that was it. 22 THE COURT: All right. And what about the alcohol experts. Which names are you referring to on .

these?

25

come across the Panafax 26 pages that Professor Vorhus had

25

sent to him which we are going to be providing as soon as court is through today. It's a 26-page --

THE COURT: You came across it. It -- how long have you had it?

MR. COLE: It just came in today.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. COLE: This morning. It's dated this morning.

THE COURT: Anything else that pertains to these witnesses?

MR. COLE: Everything that we have has been turned over.

THE COURT: All right. Well, no. Wait a second. Before you make those expressions, Mr. Madson and Mr. Chalos, it seems to me that the State has complied with Criminal Rule 16 in its spirit and its intent. Now, if there's anybody playing hide the ball here, it's the Defendants playing hide the ball.

Now, you have certain rights that you can hide the ball, because you're criminal defendant's attorneys.

But don't be complaining to the State about them hiding the ball. They're complying with the rule.

MR. : Judge --

THE COURT: Now, I've ordered you to comply with certain things, and that's the end of it. They've provided

as enough information here that complies with the rule, and they've told you they've given you everything. Now, there's not much else you can make them do, and I'm not about to make them go out and do something.

Now, I don't know about Sam Adams being heavyhanded. That's not too relevant, as far as I'm concerned right now.

MR. CHALOS: Judge, with all due respect, you ordered us three weeks ago to turn over our reports. We complied in good faith. We've given them thick reports. They've had three weeks to analyze them.

Mr. Cole is going to turn over to us today 26 pages of sophisticated calculations --

THE COURT: He just got it, he said.

MR. CHALOS: Why did he just get it? He's had this expert for how long? That's the point. I mean, we could have asked our expert to give us the calculations the day that they were testifying.

THE COURT: That's fine. All right. We've had enough hearing on this. You've heard the order of the Court. It seems to me when somebody says, "We're not going to talk" and "We've got an expert we're not going to disclose the names to," when there's a rule that says you're supposed to --

MR. CHALOS: No, we've disclosed the names.

THE COURT: -- that there's a very good example when there's an intention shown that you're going to call an expert, that you're not given information to.

So I find that both of you, in this case, have deliberately contravened the spirit of Rule 16. Now, I want you to --

MR. CHALOS: That's not true, Judge.

THE COURT: -- start complying -- please, Mr. Chalos.

MR. CHALOS: That's not true, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, I find it is true, and I don't want to have any more argument from you. So just disclose the names and addresses of witnesses and the reports of those witnesses you intend on calling.

MR. : She has that.

THE COURT: That's the end of it. That's the end of it, counsel. That's the end of it.

Now, is there anything else we can bring up?

MR. MADSON: I would certainly like to, but I guess it's the end of it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's the end of the discovery question. Now, is there anything else we can bring up?

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I think we should probably take up the exhibits I was about to introduce, if there's going to be an objection, we might as well take

וו

that up now. That's why I started with those exhibits before the break, just to make sure --

MR. MADSON: Yes, there is. First of all, relevancy. They don't -- I think we all know there was an oil spill. We're going to have more prolonged, detailed testimony on a spill, and he's going to go where it goes. It's all hearsay. He doesn't know who did it. It was all generated by other people. We expect the fact there was a spill.

Now, if you want to show how far it went, then if that's admissible, Your Honor, then I think I have the right to go in to show how far it shouldn't have gone, and what could have been done that wasn't, and I would be able to elaborate on that, but anyway, I would object to these.

THE COURT: Your objection on relevance is overruled, and as far as you taking up how far it shouldn't have gone, that remains to be seen. Kusmeyer is a case right on point. I've already ruled that you cannot show that Alyeska or some other agency didn't do their job, and as a result, the oil spill was greater than it could have been.

I've already made that ruling, Mr. Madson. If you wish me to reconsider that, you can do so in writing.

MR. MADSON: I can't do it before these are introduced, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I've already ruled on your objection as relevance. That objection is overruled.

MR. MADSON: Could I just put something on the record on this? It's much easier than having to do it in writing. It takes two minutes.

THE COURT: You've already made your objection.

Now, if you have an application to the Court, you can do so, but I've already ruled on your objection as to relevancy.

MR. MADSON: I would like to make an offer of proof, Your Honor, on the record with regard to relevancy. And it's more than relevancy. It goes much further than that, and I can do it very briefly.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MR. MADSON: Because I think the Court, with all due respect, is missing the point here. This has nothing to do with that case, for the very -- the reason is, Captain Hazelwood is charged with creating a risk, a risk that damage will occur by spilling oil in an amount of over \$100,000.00. That's the damage.

Okay. There's the creation of the risk. If part of that risk is the consideration of others that are part of the whole process to stop that from occurring, then I think we have the right to show that it isn't like the case the Court cited, where it's an intervening separate act

that one has no right to rely on, because this is a situation where everybody in the industry knew there was an oil contingency plan for this very purpose. That was part of it.

And to show them that they didn't do their job, isn't to show that there was an intervening cause. Not at all. It was to show that this reduces the risk that was involved, if there was a plan that was supposed to prevent the very thing from happening.

THE COURT: All right. Your offer of proof has been made. The ruling stands, Mr. Madson. Evidence of Alyeska's, for example, failure in your opinion to take prompt steps to reduce this damage comes directly out of Kusmider, as far as I'm concerned.

The culpable state of mind in this case is reckless. The damage of \$100,000.00 or more, risk of damage, is a circumstance. And an intervening cause as to a circumstance is covered by Kusmider. So I'm going to continue in this type of ruling.

Now, you can make your applications, and I suggest you do so if you have other evidence you want to introduce so you can preserve your record, but I'm giving you a clue as to my ruling. It will be consistent with the Kusmider case.

Is there anything else we can take up?

MR. MADSON: Only a cup of coffee. 2 THE COURT: All right. We stand in recess. 3 THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands in recess, subject to call. 4 5 (A recess was taken from 10:20 a.m. until 10:40 a.m.) 6 THE CLERK: This Court now resumes its session. 7 THE COURT: You may proceed. 8 MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor. (Pause) 10 THE COURT: We're on the record, ladies and 11 gentlemen. 12 BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming) 13 Before the break, I think we were talking Q 14 about \_\_\_\_\_ and that persons were drawing charts, and 1.5 then they'd be put into computers. Is that right? 16 Yes, that's correct. 17 All right. Showing you what's been marked as 18 Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 116 for identification, would 19 you please identify that? 20 This is a map of Prince William Sound and 21 it's a -- it's the oil identified in the upper righthand 22 corner as a black mass. There's a heavy thick oil legend 23 over here on the lefthand side in the box. 24

Okay. And the box --

25

₫ 5 6

1

2

7

10

11

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

\_25

Yes. This is from the state of Alaska. Department of Environmental Conservation. It's an indication -- it indicates the spread of the oil on March 25th, 1989 from 1635 to 1800, which would be 4:35 to 6:00 o'clock in the afternoon. It's all indicated as heavy slick, 60 square miles in this upper righthand area of the map.

- And which DEC employee's name is on there?
- This is also Mr. Sotner.
- Does that, as best you remember, accurately reflect the placement of the oil on that date and time?

Yes. That would have been the -- that would have Α been the approximate location of the oil at that time.

I'm showing you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 114 for identification. Would you please identify that?

Yes. This is -- this is a map of the oil, again, the oil depicted in this -- on this particular map, dated March 26th, 0815 to 0930, there's heavy sheen indicated by the legend on the left, and there's also heavy slick indicated as a -- as part of the legend.

- Q Which DEC employee --
- Α And this is also Mr. Sotner.
- Q And to the best that you can recall, does that

A Yes. This is an expanded diagram of an island -and I'd have to look here to see the name of the island. I
believe this is Night Island, in this vicinity here. And
just to the southeast, or southwest, rather, of Naked
Island, and it depicts the spread of the oil down along the
easternmost boundary of Night Island, and also up into the
space between Night Island -- it's Night Island passage -Q Sir, perhaps you can point on the big chart.
A Yes.

(Pause)

1;

Yes. The oil was spreading down Night Island passage in -- about this vicinity, and also had come down into this vicinity, and had come down a little bit, down in this direction here, towards Montague Island -- Montague Island being along this area here. This is Night Island. Naked Island indicated here.

O Okay. And -- you can go ahead and sit down. The Exhibit I just showed you ,which is Plaintiff's 113 for identification, what is the date on that?

A This is dated March 29th, 016 -- 0615 to 0800 hours. And this is indicated that this is done with IR -- with daylight.

- Q What does that mean?
- A Infrared with daylight.
- Q Who's name is on that?

21

22

24

25

A Mr. Sundat (PH) and Mr. Lefsi (PH).

Q Who's Mr. Lefsi?

A I don't know Mr. Lefsi.

Q Okay. Now, to the best that you can recall, is the placement of the oil accurate on that chart for that date and time?

A I believe that's accurate.

Q Showing you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 112 for identification, would you please identify that?

A Yes. This is an exhibit that shows combined oil from March 30, 1989, combined -- these -- this was a combined map of Joe Sotner and Richard Sundat from March 30, 1989, between 1700 hours, which would be 5:00 o'clock, and 1856, which would be 6:56 in the evening.

Q Does that chart break down the oil as sheen or heavy or something?

A Yes, this breaks -- this chart is broken down into wind rows, sheen and heavy oil.

Q What is wind rows?

A A wind row would be an isolated finger of oil that the wind had -- had separated out, and it would be just lined up in a straight line, or blown into a straight line.

Q To the best that you can recall, does that chart

25

accurately reflect the placement of the oil on that date These were the -- this is the report that we received from Mr. Sotner and Mr. Sundat on that date. MS. HENRY: At this time, the State would move into evidence Plaintiff's Exhibit 112 through 116. MR. MADSON: I object to those, Your Honor, on the grounds stated earlier, plus they're merely cumulative. They have no probative value, and if it does, it's certainly outweighed by any prejudicial effect it THE COURT: All right. Those objections are MS. HENRY: Thank you, Your Honor. May they be THE COURT: They're admitted.

(State's Exhibits 112 through 116 were received in evidence.)

Sir, I'm showing you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 111 for identification. Can you

Yes. This is an aerial photograph taken by Errol

Matthew, who is a contractor	to the Department of
Environmental Conservation.	It shows the Exxon Valdez
which and also the I b	pelieve that's the Exxon tanker
Baton Rouge.	•

- Q Are they connected \_\_\_\_\_ --
- A They're tied -- the Baton Rouge is moored alongside the Exxon Valdez.
  - Q Do you know where they were at that time?
- A The boats were at Bligh Reef. The Exxon Valdez was -- was rocking back and forth with the tide on Bligh Reef.
  - Q Does that photo also depict any oil?
- A Yes, that photo depicts oil contained by a containment boom in front of the Exxon Valdez and the Baton Rouge.
  - Q Do you know what day that photograph was taken?
  - A I believe this would have been taken March 26th.
- Q All right. Do you know what day of the week that was? Do you remember?
  - A March 26th would have been on Sunday.
- Q It would have been Sunday morning, or Sunday evening. Do you know?
  - A I can't tell from this -- the --
  - Q Do you recall a storm coming up on Sunday?
  - A Yes. There was a windstorm that started on

Sunday afternoon about 2:30 or so.

Q And based on that can you tell from this photograph if it was taken before that storm started?

A I believe -- no, I -- there appear to be some swells, and that may have been taken in the afternoon on the 26th.

Q All right. And does it accurately reflect the placement of the two vessels, the boom, the oil within the boom, and then also some sheen in the water?

A Yes. It certainly reflects the accurate placement of the two vessels, the boom, and the oil, and the oil distribution across -- away from the vessels.

MS. HENRY: The State would move into evidence Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 111.

MR. MADSON: Well, I object, Your Honor, on the grounds raised earlier, and certainly as to relevance. Is this to show the place where the boom or the containment, or what? I don't know the purpose of this photograph, is what I'm saying. There's a number of photos already of the oil, and how many more we need, it's certainly cumulative. It doesn't show containment.

THE COURT: Why don't you come up here for a minute.

(The following was had at the bench:)

THE COURT: Mr. Madson, when you say on the

evidence, some oil samples, and some videotape of the oil

. \_25

on a beach, on -- out in Prince William Sound that was damaged as a result of the grounding of the Exxon Valdez.

- Q All right. If you would -- using the chart, can you show us where Elinor Island is?
  - A Yes.
  - Q The pointer is behind you to your right, sir.

    (Pause)

A Yes. Elinor Island is right in this vicinity, right here, at the tip of this Night Island group, adjacent to Night Island passage.

- Q And although you indicated a little earlier, can you give us an idea of generally the path of the oil?
- A Yes. The oil essentially moved down through here, like this.
  - Q And so it impacted Elinor Island?
  - A It impacted Elinor Island.
  - Q What's the island just below Elinor Island?
- A That's Ingot Island. Below that, it's Disc Island, and I believe this -- this is all part of Night Island, through here.
  - Q Was there any particular beach that you --
  - A That I looked at?
  - Q -- looked at?
- A Yes. I landed in Northwest Bay, which is up in this portion, the northwestern portion of Elinor Island.

ì

Q All right. You can go ahead and resume your seat.

Did you, in fact, take some samples of oil from that beach?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q And you also said another purpose was to take some videotape?

A Yes. We took some videotape. I brought a employee of the department with me to operate the video camera.

- Q And who was that?
- A That was Laurie Telford.
- Now, were you wearing any special clothing when you did this?

A Yes. I had a Mustang flotation suit on -- it's orange in color. And also I had on some rubber gloves when we were collecting samples of the oil. And in addition, I had some coveralls, some protective coveralls, to protect the Mustang suit from --

Q To protect what?

A To protect the Mustang suit, the orange suit, from contamination with the oil.

The protective coveralls were a disposable coverall, both -- one pair -- I had several different pairs. Some were white, some were yellow in color.

. 2

Q Did the helicopter pilot make you do anything with these?

A Yes, the helicopter pilot made me take them off every time I went to get back into the helicopter, because they were covered with oil. And they were disposed of in plastic bags into the baggage compartment into the helicopter, and properly disposed of when we arrived in Valdez.

Q And did you have an opportunity to review the videotape that was taken that day?

A Yes, I did.

(Pause)

Q I'm showing you what has been marked as
Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 118 for identification. Do you
recognize that, sir?

A Yes, this is the -- this is a tape of the -- that was taken on Elinor Island.

- Q On April 15th?
- A On April 15th, yes.
- Q And when was the most recent time you've reviewed that?
  - A A couple of days ago in your office.
- Q Now, does that accurately reflect scenes of you taking samples of oil, and then also scenes of the beaches on Elinor Island?

A Yes, it does. It very accurately depicts the operation that I was performing on Elinor Island on that day.

MS. HENRY: The State would move into evidence Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 118.

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, with all due respect. This is highly, totally irrelevant. It's taken on, as I understand it, April 15th of a beach scene. There's no relevance whatsoever to what the State has to prove, which is the amount of damage or risk, risk of damage over \$100,000.00. That has been shown a hundred times over.

This is cumulative. It's designed only for one purpose, and that is to prejudice my client in the eyes of the jury. It has no other purpose, and I strenuously object.

THE COURT: Will counsel approach the bench.

(The following was had at the bench:)

THE COURT: What is the purpose of this?

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, this is not for the damage of property, but it's person is to (inaudible) and we have to show that an oil spill, in this case, meets \_\_\_\_\_ risk of damage by widely dangerous means.

THE COURT: Mr. Madson?

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I made my objection.

THE COURT: All right. The objection is

overruled.

overruled.

you were taken a second or secon

(The following was had in open court:)

MS. HENRY: Sir, before we --

THE COURT: It's admitted.

MS. HENRY: Thank you.

(State's Exhibit 118 was received in evidence.)

BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming)

Q Before we play the video, did you have sound when you were taping the video?

A Yes. There was some sound on the video. During a portion of the video, the helicopter was running on the beach, and that overwhelmed any -- most of the audio portion of the videotape.

- Q So listening to the audio isn't going to be very helpful?
  - A It would not be very helpful at all.
- Q Okay. So before I actually play it, perhaps you can explain a couple of things on it. There's a shot showing a creek with something in it. What is that?

A Well, there's some oil. It looks like little shadows floating by, and it's actually little globules of oil sort of washing off of the beach down into the sea.

Q And there's also a shot of a cooler. What is that for?

25

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

\_25 A The cooler was used to preserve the samples, to keep the samples at a -- there was some blue ice in the cooler, and we're storing the samples in the cooler. In addition, I was also carrying equipment with me in the cooler.

- Q There are also some shots -- there appear to be some shots of the beach. Where was that taken?
  - A Those were beaches in Northwest Bay. The --
- Q How about the shots from the helicopter? What were those?
- A The shots from the helicopter were taken along the shoreline in Northwest Bay and kind of along through this -- well, Northwest Bay is kind of a -- shaped in -- like this. I don't know how to describe that.
  - Q Like a W, maybe?
- A Like a W. And it was flown around -- we flew around, and I had the video camera hung in the window of the helicopter. There's a small, little window that can be opened, and occasionally you'll -- I wasn't able to view all of the videotaping as it was taking place, but -- and occasionally you'll see the window frame include into the photograph.
  - Q Now, was this taken at any particular time?
- A This would have been at low tide, and the videotape depicts the staining of the oil along the shore

- Q Was there any booming done in that area?
- A Yes. There was some booming in place. In addition, there was a rope mop skimmer.
  - Q What is that?

A A rope mop skimmer is a device that -- it's a specially treated mop type of arrangement. It's about -- oh, this large in diameter, and it -- you roll that out around some pulleys and through the oil, and then it's -- the mop is squeegied, you know, back into a drum and the oil is collected. This device is -- collects the oil, and then as it runs around back on to the -- there's a limited portion, view of that.

We attempted to hover over that area to show the rope mop skimmer. That skimmer -- there was -- the helicopter didn't have enough power to remain in place.

- Q And does the video also show some booms in place?
- A Yes, it does.

MS. HENRY: Now, at this time, I request to be able to play the video.

THE COURT: How long is the video tape?

MS. HENRY: The first one that I was going to pay was about twelve minutes.

THE COURT: All right. No sound. Is that correct?

```
Α
              The Amoco Guidez.
 2
         0
              And where was that from?
 3
         Α
              I believe that ship belonged to Amoco.
 4
         Q
              Is that an American company? American-Arabian
 5
    company?
         Α
              I'm not sure. I'm not sure.
6
7
              Do you know if the captain was prosecuted for
8
   that spill?
         Α
              (Inaudible).
10
              MS. HENRY: Objection. Relevance.
11
              THE COURT: Don't answer the question.
12
   Sustained.
              BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)
13
14
              Any other ones that were larger?
15
         Α
              I'm not aware of any others at the moment?
         Q
              Why did you take that video?
16
17
              I was requested to -- to gather --
         Α
18
         Q
              By who?
19
         Α
              By Dean Guaneli.
              Who is Dean Guaneli?
20
         Q
              Dean Guaneli is with the Attorney General's
21
   office.
22
         Q
              And that's with the state of Alaska, right?
23
24
         Α
              Yes, that's correct.
25
         Q
              And this was taken April 15th, was it not?
```

somebody else told him, then that would be hearsay, and I

24

1 don't see how that is going to assist the finder of 2 fact \_\_\_\_\_ in any event, so I'm going to sustain the objection. 4 BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming) 5 The oil that you were sampling, the video showed Q you putting oil in a jar. I assume that was you, I --6 7 Yes. Okay. You kept those samples for some purpose? 8 9 Α Yes. 10 Q What for? 11 Α Those were collected as demonstrative evidence 12 samples. 13 Q That it was, in fact, crude oil? That it was, in fact, a mixture of crude oil and 14 15 sea water and other amalgams. 16 Q You also answered some questions from Ms. Henry regarding booming that we could see, skimmers, right? 17 18 A skimmer, yes. Α A skimmer and some booms. 19 Q Α 20 Yes. What are booms? 21 Booms are devices that are -- typically they're 22 -- they'll consist of a float, and -- in the upper portion 23 -- and a skirt in the bottom portion, and then the --24 typically it will be the weight on the bottom side of the

21

22

23

24

25

skirt to hold the skirt in place.

There are also sorted booms, which are simply a floating component of sorted material that's used to gather oil off of water, or off of the land.

- Q Are there both types employed in the video?
- A I believe there were.
- Q Who put them there?
- A I don't know.
- Q What purpose do they have, just to contain oil?
- A To protect the beach, typically. To gather oil.
- Q Do you know when they were placed there?
- A No, I do not.
- Q Do you know what their -- somebody must have put them there for a purpose; you said to protect the beach.

  It looked like it was too late, right?
- A Possibly they were put in place there to protect other beaches so that the oil, when it was washed off the beach at high tide, would not wander around and impact their beaches.
- Q And who would have -- whose purpose -- I mean, whose responsibility is it to put those booms there?
- MS. HENRY: Objection. The witness has already answered he doesn't even know who put them there.

THE COURT: Mr. Madson?

1 BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming) 2 You don't know who put them there, or who's responsible to put them there, to prevent oil from 3 spreading? 4 MS. HENRY: Same objection. 5 THE COURT: He's answered he doesn't know who put 6 them there. Was that what you said? 7 Do you know who put them there? 8 THE WITNESS: I don't know personally who put 9 them there. 10 11 THE COURT: All right. BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming) 12 Q Do you know who was supposed to put them there? 13 MS. HENRY: Objection. Speculation and 14 relevance. 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 17 BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming) What were you doing there, as a DEC 18 Q 19 representative? I was there collecting demonstrative evidence 20 samples, and taking --21 At the request of the Attorney General's office? 22 The Attorney General's office, Mr. Guaneli. 23 And you had no knowledge at all about the 24 different roles, including DEC, what they play in oil · <del>=</del> 25

1 containment or prevention or anything like that? 2 MS. HENRY: Objection. Relevance. 3 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. MADSON: No other questions. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 MS. HENRY: I have no other questions, Your 7 Honor. 8 THE COURT: You're excused sir. (The witness was excused.) 10 THE COURT: Call your next witness. 11 (Pause) 12 Whereupon, 13 JOHN BYERS 14 called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows: - 17 THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full 18 name, and spell your last name? 19 THE WITNESS: My name is John Byers, B-y-e-r-s. 20 THE CLERK: And what is your current mailing 21 address? 22 THE WITNESS: My current mailing address, 222 23 West 7th Avenue, Box 17, Anchorage. 24 THE CLERK: And your current occupation, sir? 25 THE COURT: I'm a Radioman in the Coast Guard.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. HENRY:

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

- Q Sir, how long have you been in the Coast Guard?
- A Fifteen years.
- Q And were you recently requested to execute a subpoena issued by the -- at the request of the District Attorney's office?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
- Q In fact, there were two subpoenas. Is that correct?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
  - Q And what were you requested to do?
- A I was requested to proceed to Valdez, and to make some recordings off of an original tape to verify that they were accurate and correct.
  - Q And what tape are we talking about?
  - A These two tapes that I have here.
- Q Okay. The original tape, what kind of -- what was this original tape?
- A The original tape was a magnasync recorder, which is a 30-channel recorder, and it is commonly used to record radio traffic, and that's the purpose of the tape.
- Q Now, with the recording, I assume that you record at the time the traffic, radio traffic, is occurring? Is that --

A It started and continues for 24 hours. It does not stop. It is a continuous reporting. Any dead spots, or anything else, would be on that tape.

- Q And are the original tapes kept by the United States Coast Guard in the ordinary course of business?
  - A Yes, they are.
- Q And specifically, the tape that you were recording off of, was that a tape that was originally recorded on March 24, 1989?
  - A Yes, it was.
- Q Now, the subpoenas that you received, were they specific as to a time on the tape that you were to record?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
  - Q Now, how could you tell a time on the tape?
- A The recording instrument itself has a display for the time. You can enter in the time that you wish to go to, and the machine will electronically seek that time. In the course of recording onto the tape, it also records the time, and that's how I was able to go to the exact times.
- Q And there were actually two subpoenas for you to record, two different times?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
- Q And you have before you two tapes. Are those the tapes that you --
  - A Yes, they are.

22

23

24

25

Q Now, the subpoena, the first subpoena, do you recall the time that was requested that you tape the conversation?

A Yes. If I can refer to these. The first time was at 0031, minute 31, and that ran through minute 31. It was actually a couple of seconds in there. It was minute 31 and 35 seconds through minute 31 and 57 seconds, which is on the tape.

- Q So that tape would be a conversation that occurred at 31 minutes after midnight on the 24th?
  - A Yes.
- Q And is that an accurate copy of that conversation?
  - A Yes, it is.
  - Q From the original?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
    - Q And what about the second one?
    - A Also on this first tape, if I may --
    - Q Sure.
    - A -- there was also minute 38 through 39.
    - Q So it continued for --
- A There was a gap of seven minutes on what had been requested, which was blank. That was the dead time.
  - Q All right.
  - A The recording which made this is voice actuated.

22

23

24

25

questions that I have.

MR. MADSON: I guess I can't ask him, Your
Honor. I don't know what it's for, so I don't know any
questions. Well, maybe I do. A lawyer -- it's hard for a
lawyer to sit here and not say anything.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MADSON:

- Q What did you record that on, sir? What did you record these tapes, what kind of equipment?
  - A What did I use to record these?
  - Q Yeah, right.
    - A I used a Dentron cassette recorder.
  - Q A what?
    - A A Dentron?
    - Q Dentron.
    - A Cassette recorder.
- Q How did you do that? Did you hold a microphone at --
  - A No, sir.
  - Q -- \_\_\_\_\_ speaker, or what?
- A No, sir. This is hard wired through, meaning it has a connection from the speaker jack of the 30-channel into the cassette player.
- Q Is that a variable speed cassette player that you use, recorder?

```
Α
              No, not to my knowledge.
2
         Q
              You don't know.
         Α
              I do not know.
3
              Was it 110 powered, or battery-powered at the
4
   time?
5
         Α
              It was 110.
6
7
              And do you know what its characteristics are, its
   performance characteristics, pitch and wow and flutter and
8
   all that kind of stuff?
9
              I have no idea.
10
11
         Q
              And you made it only because the District
   Attorney's office subpoenaed you and requested you to do
12
   this?
13
              Yes, sir.
         Α
14
         Q
              So you did it?
15
         Α
              Yes, sir.
16
              MR. MADSON: I have no other questions.
17
              MS. HENRY: No questions, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: You're excused.
19
                                   (The witness was excused.)
20
              MR. COLE: Your Honor, at this time, the State
21
   would call Captain George Greiner.
22
              (Pause)
23
   Whereupon,
```

GEORGE K. GREINER, Jr.

1

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full name, and spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: George Kirk Greiner, Jr., G-r-e-i-n-e-r.

THE CLERK: And what is your current mailing address?

THE WITNESS: 3107 Northeast 160th Street, Ridgefield -- that's R-i-d-g-e -- Washington, 98642.

THE CLERK: And your current occupation, sir?

THE WITNESS: I'm a consultant.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COLE:

Q Captain Greiner, why have you been called to testify in this matter?

A I've been called on behalf of the State to identify the damage to the bottom of the tanker through a series of photographs and analyze it, to do a reconstruction of the track line of the Exxon Valdez after it left the narrows in Prince William Sound, and also to evaluate the actions after the grounding by the captain.

- Q Where do you live right now?
- A I live in the state of Washington, Ridgefield,

safety field.

- 2
- Q Would you describe what you do for a living now?

Yes, sir. I'm a marine safety consultant.

How long have you been involved in the maritime

- 3
  - Actually, I do two things. I run a company called Maritime
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- y
- 10
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 14
- 17
- 13
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

industry?

A The industry -- since I graduated from the Coast
Guard Academy in 1953.

and Environmental Consultants, and that is an expert

referral company; and I also do consulting in the marine

Q Would you -- let's talk about your educational background. Where did you attend the Coast Guard Academy in 1953?

A The Coast Guard Academy is located in New London, Connecticut.

- Q How long a program is it?
- A It's a four-year program.
- And do you receive some type of degree?
- A Yes, sir. I received a Bachelor of Science degree.

Q And did you attend any schools after attending the Academy?

A Yes, sir. I attended a number of service schools, and I also attended a college -- University of

Puget Sound -- later on, in Washington.

2

Q I'd like to focus on a couple of these, the Navy firefighting in 1954?

3

A Yes, sir.

5

Q What was that?

ć

A That's a school conducted by the Navy which basically teaches officers how to fight fires on vessels.

8

Q What -- did you attend a school named the Desland Engineering School?

9

11

A Yes, sir. Desland Engineer School -- Desland stands for Destroyer Atlantic, and it's a Navy school. I believe it's a 16-week school preparing officers for the duty of engineer officer on military ships. Engineer officer is the equivalent of a chief engineer on merchant ships.

12

Q When did you attend that school?

15 16

A I attended that school in 1955.

17

Q And after that, did you the attend the Navy Damage Control School?

19

18

A Yes, sir, I did.

20

Q When was that?

21

A That was 1955 also, located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

2324

Q And what was the purpose of attending that school?

25

 $\neg$ 

. 25

A The Desland Engineer School -- I mean, I'm sorry -- the Damage Control School is a Navy school also, and that is one which trains officers how to combat flooding and damage to vessels. In other words, fires, flooding, collision, et cetera. I guess it's what the name applies, damage control; the control of damage on vessels.

Q What did they -- what were -- were there any specific courses that they taught you in that school?

A Yes, sir. They taught you about vessel stability. They taught you some about strength of materials, the manner of repairing -- temporarily repairing damage on vessels, holes in the hull or -- and bulkheads, and such like that.

O Did you attend a Loran school in 1956?

A Yes, sir. Loran stands for Long Range Ace
Navigation, and it's a school for prospective commanding
officers. It's a radio transmitting station.

Q Now, I notice that several of these schools are Navy schools. Why were you attending Navy schools?

Weren't you in the Coast Guard?

A Yes, sir. I was in the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard sends their people to Navy schools for several reasons. Number one, there aren't enough people in the Coast Guard to support a school, specialized school, in the Coast Guard, and number two, the Coast Guard operates under

the Navy in time of war, so that there is a relationship.

Q What school, then, did you attend in 1958?

A I went to the Merchant Marine Safety School, then located in New London, Connecticut.

Q Why did you go there?

A The Merchant Marine Safety School is the school which they send officers to before they enter the marine safety field, or the Merchant Marine safety field. The Merchant Marine safety field is the regulation of commercial shipping. But before they went into that type of duty, they had to go through and successfully complete that school.

Q And what was taught at that particular school?

A There's a lot taught at it. A lot of regulations. Code of Federal regulations. The manner of inspecting vessels — in other words, how to apply the regulations. Licensing of people to sail as officers in the Merchant Marine. The investigation of casualties that occurs in the Merchant Marine.

It basically touches the whole realm of information necessary to at least start out in that field.

Q Investigation of casualties. Will you explain to the jury what that particular area was?

A Yes, sir. Any time an American vessel has a casualty in U.S. waters, or a -- I'm sorry, anywhere in the

world -- or a foreign vessel has a casualty in U.S. waters, the Coast Guard investigates it. If it exceeds damage in the amount of a certain amount of dollars, \$25,000.00 I think it is now.

Also, if the vessel grounds, if there's a collision, if there's injury where a person is injured over 72 hours, the Coast Guard is charged with an investigating casualty, and this is the procedure, the teaching of the procedure to use by a person that's investigating it.

There is a second half to the investigation, and that is that, since the Coast Guard has licensed people, they -- when they find negligence or misconduct, they take action against the license, and the investigator would be the one who took action against the license, and the investigator would be the one who took action against the license before an administrative law judge.

Q Now, does the accident training that you receive include some knowledge about salvage and what's required?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor. He said he went to a marine safety school, not an accident school.

THE COURT: You've been asked the question. Objection is overruled.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Did the area that you were taught about accidents and safety, did that include any information about salvage?

9

10

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A No, sir, it didn't.

Q Now, the next school that you attended is the Army Instructor Training School in 1967. Is that correct?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q And what was that for?

A I was assigned as the officer in charge of the Marine Safety School. That's the same school that I went to nine years previously. It is now located in Yorktown, Virginia. And, as such, I would be expected to teach in that school, so they send you to a school to teach you how to teach.

- Q The next area that you -- or the next educational program is a computer institute program. Is that correct?
  - A Yes, sir. In 1976.
  - Q And what was that for?

A That's just an orientation on how to use computers. I was bringing them into our office in the Coast Guard and I wanted to know more about them.

- Q You received a law degree in 1977?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q And where was that at?
- A University of Puget Sound.
- Q And how many years did it take you to get that?
- A Four years, sir.
- Q And in 1978, you attended a United States Coast

 Guard hazardous chemicals school. Why was that?

A Yes, sir. One of the duties that the Coast Guard Captain of the Port has is to regulate the handling of hazardous cargoes, and to clean up, or supervise the cleanup, of spills of hazardous materials. That may involve evacuation of areas.

It may not involve the Coast Guard directly in the clean up. They may just oversee the spiller, and see that he cleans properly. Or it may involve the Coast Guard.

Q Now, how long were you in the Coast Guard?

A I retired in 1982. I graduated from the Coast Guard Academy in 1953, but technically, I was in the Coast Guard when I entered the Coast Guard Academy in 1949. So that would make 33 years.

Q Would you give the jury an idea of the positions that you held while you were in the Coast Guard?

A Yes, sir. I held a number of positions, but I'll run through them. I spent three years on ships out of New York, 327-foot vessels — these were the largest ones the Coast Guard had at the time. From there, I went to commanding officer of the Loran Station in Cape Sarachef, Alaska. That was my first tour in Alaska.

From there, I went down to Alameida, California, where I was the base engineer, and industrial manager.

Then I went to my first marine safety assignment in New York, starting in 1958, and running for four years.

From there, I came back to Alaska again in the marine safety field from 1962 to 1965. From 1965 on, I went back to -- until 1967, I went back to sea again, aboard a Coast Guard cutter, 327-foot cutter, as the engineer officer, and the ship was based in Almeida, California.

In 1967 and 1968, I went to Yorktown, Virginia and was the officer in charge and instructor at the Merchant Marine Safety School. The executive officer billet became vacant, and I was moved up into that, and so I spent two years as executive officer of the base.

Then I went to Marine Inspection again, in Seattle, Washington, for four years -- for five years, and that's where I went to law school, or started it. From there, I went to Washington, D.C., where I was executive secretary of the Marine Safety Council.

The Marine Safety Council is the organization in the Coast Guard that handles the promulgation and overview of Coast Guard regulations. In other words, if a regulation is to be issued by the Coast Guard, my office was the one that handled it on a day-to-day basis.

From there, I went to commanding officer of the Marine Safety Office in Portland, Oregon, and that

. 25

assignment involved not only Captain of the Port Authority, but the officer in Charge of Marine Inspection. Officer in Charge of Marine Inspection is an antiquated term, but it's the senior person that is responsible for the safety of inspection and licensing and investigation of marine ships, merchant marine ships.

Q In that particular port.

A In that -- in that particular instance, it was the state of Oregon and the southern half of the state of Washington. That was the area.

Q Now, would you explain to the jury what the term Captain of the Port is?

A The Captain of the Port is a term, an individual has the authority to regulate shipping in a port subject to the regulations. In other words, the -- his power is restricted by the regulations. But basically, he can make vessels move. He can require vessels not to move. He does inspection of certain operations of vessels, primarily while they're either anchored or at dock. The handling of hazardous and dangerous cargoes within a port. These are the responsibilities that he has.

If there is a fire or an accident, he may be the one who is in charge of the Coast Guard activities, fire fighting -- if the Coast Guard is involved in it; they usually are. But he would oversee the safety aspect.

Q Would you tell the jury what your experience was in the Coast Guard specifically dealing with marine casualty investigations?

A Yes, sir. I -- when I was in New York, was the first time I was involved in casualty --

Q When was this?

A -- investigation. And that basically was back in 1980 -- 1958 through 1962. I was assigned to the Casualty Investigation Branch. We had probably ten or twelve officers assigned to it. The senior officer who was in charge of investigations was an attorney.

There was another attorney in the office; the rest of us were not attorneys. And I broke in as an investigator underneath them. I spent over a year in that particular aspect in the New York office.

- O What were you doing during that time?
- A Primarily investigating misconduct of merchant seamen and when they occurred, casualties to vessels, and there were several major casualties when I was there.
- Q When you say investigating casualties of major vessels, what do you mean?
- A We want to determine what the cause was, whether there was any negligence by the people involved. In most cases, it's -- the watch -- the officer that's on watch on the bridge, if it's a navigational problem, that could be

the master, and is in certain cases. It could be the pilot, if there was a pilot aboard.

Q Did it also have to do with any problems in the Coast Guard's navigational system? Would you investigate things like that?

A There would be a person not from my office, from the Navigation Office, who would go out and check to see if the aids in the area were operating properly.

Q Well, after your three years in New York, four years in New York, where did you next get experience in marine casualty investigations?

A I came here to Alaska, to Juneau, Alaska. At that time, the Juneau office was the only Marine Safety office in Alaska. So we covered all of Alaska.

Q Would you explain what you did there?

A Because the office was a small office, we did everything. In other words, we issued licenses, including grading pilots for pilotage license in Alaska. We would investigate casualties. We would inspect the vessels, the Alaska ferries, other vessels that were in the area, and I think I mentioned investigate casualties.

Q Where did you travel take you investigating casualties out of Juneau?

A Well, most of it was in southeast Alaska. I got up into the Bering Sea several times. I was at Valdez

5

7

8

10

וו

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2425

several times. And basically, it would take us wherever there was a commercial vessel operating that required Coast Guard inspection.

- Q And when did you complete your tour there?
- A In Alaska? 1965.
- Q When is the next time you were involved in a marine casualty investigation with the Coast Guard?

A When I was the officer in charge of the school in Yorktown, and that would have been 1967, I was the one who taught the course in investigations. In other words, I taught the other officers basically how investigations were to be conducted. I think it was about that time that I also wrote a book on investigations.

Q What was that book that you wrote?

A I wrote a -- I'm sorry. It wasn't. It was my next tour of duty. It was when I was in Seattle.

It was a book of some 170 pages, I believe, that was an in-house book to be used by Coast Guard personnel in investigating casualties, and accident misconduct by seamen.

Q Now, after leaving Yorktown as instructor, when was the next time that you worked in the area of marine casualty investigation?

A After leaving Yorktown, sir? Went on to Seattle. In Seattle, I was there for five years, starting

0 145

Q What were you doing there?

A The first year, I was in charge of licensing. We had a staff of two officers and several civilians. We issued licenses and merchant mariners' documents to all merchant seamen that were eligible for them.

The next three years, I was in charge of investigations. We had a staff of probably five or six officers at that time who were doing investigations, and the last year, I was in charge of inspection of vessels.

- Now, you retired from the Coast Guard when?
- A 1982, May.
- Q And did you continue to be involved in marine casualty investigation after retiring from the Coast Guard.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q Would you tell the jury what your experience was after you retired from this area?
- A Well, I've been involved in the investigation of a number of casualties, ranging from recreational boats to major vessel casualties. The -- I don't have the exact number, or breakdown, of the type, but I can tell you those that we've -- that I've done -- of major vessels that I've done reconstructions on.
  - Q Would you tell the jury that?
  - A The first acquaintance that I had with a major

investigation of a marine casualty was the Andrea

Dorea/Stockholm. Now, these were two famous ships that

collided north of New York.

The Coast Guard was not involved in it, but the analysis of the course recorder was something that I became interested in, and talked to the security people about it, and to the authors of two books that wrote what caused the casualty. Again, there was no official Coast Guard involvement in that.

However, in New York, the Santa Rosa, a passenger ship, collided with the Volcan (PH), a freighter, and later the Constitution, another passenger vessel, collided with the Gelanta (PH). I was involved with both of those. I was not the senior investigator in them, but I was involved in the reconstruction of the track lines of both vessels before and up to the collision.

When I was stationed in Seattle, there were three major collisions in the Strait of Wandafuka (PH). These were all in fog, and I don't remember the names of the vessels except for one. One was the American flag vessel C.E. Dant. But all of them involved collision between an inbound and an outbound vessel, and to a certain — required a reconstruction of the track lines leading up to them.

The next one was the grounding of the Mobile in

2 5

the Columbia River, which was a tanker. The Ming Winter, a freighter that grounded in the Columbia River. The Tosca, a foreign freighter that collided with a fishing vessel and sank it off of northern California in the mid-1986s.

The Arco Anchorage, which was a tanker that went aground in December of 1985 in Port Angelus, Washington, and there was a significant spill of oil in that case.

That vessel was operated under a pilot at the time, and a reconstruction was done, and a hearing held, at which I testified.

I have the current one, and there's one other that I'm just starting.

Q Now, included in these marine casualty investigations, have you been asked -- have you had to look at damage that was sustained by the vessels involved in any of these incidents?

A Yes, sir. One of the jobs in the Coast Guard, of course, is the overseeing the repair of vessels, so whenever a vessel is -- sustains damage, if it is an

A flag vessel, the Coast Guard inspector will be involved. The investigator and the inspector may work hand in hand, they may not work hand in hand. But both of them, and I've had both jobs, will look at the damage and the inspector isn't particularly interested in what caused it, or an analysis of it, but he does it anyway, for his own

information. The investigator is, of course, and that is part of his investigation, is analyzing the damage -- when it's in dry dock.

Q And have you been also involved in the salvage operations that have gone on after tankers have been involved in accidents or collisions?

A Not really, no.

Q Now, would you tell the jury, have you been asked to consult in your professional -- in your consulting work -- what type of consulting work do you do now?

A Marine safety.

Q Have you been asked to testify in the past?

A Yes, sir.

Q Can you give the jury an idea of the number of times that you've been required to testify (inaudible)? An approximation?

A Okay. In all the cases that I've been involved with since I retired, I might have testified in between 30 and 35 cases.

Q And prior to that, were you required to testify when you were in the Coast Guard?

A No, sir. Coast Guard personnel very infrequently testify. It generally is a fact witness. I can only remember once when I was in the Coast Guard that I testified, and it was in Juneau, Alaska.

Q The work that you have done as consulting, have you done primarily Plaintiff work, or primarily Defendant work, or what?

A. I've done about 60 percent Plaintiff work, which includes several criminal cases -- I'm sorry. 60 percent Plaintiff and 35 percent Defendant. That doesn't add up to a hundred percent. 5 percent is nonlitigation work, and of the defense cases I've represented, I've been involved in one criminal case.

Q Have you been, since being involved in your private consulting firm, have you been qualified as an expert in other court jurisdictions?

A Yes, sir.

Q Would you give the jury an idea of how many times that has occurred?

A It occurs every time that you appear as an expert. Marine cases are primarily held in federal courts, so the federal courts that I've been qualified as an expert are in Anchorage, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco and Hawaii. And I don't think -- I think that's all the federal courts.

Q You have -- you indicated you were asked to provide services for the state of Alaska in this matter. When were you asked to do this?

I don't remember the precise date. I remember it

4

6

7

9

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

was within a few days after the Exxon Valdez went aground. It would have been late March.

Q What were you asked to do at that time?

A I was asked to come up to Alaska and board the vessel, assist in the investigation with the view of doing a reconstruction of the track line of the vessel.

- Q Are you being paid for your services?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Would you tell the jury what that contract (inaudible)?

A That's a contract to be paid at the rate of \$95.00 an hour, plus expenses.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole, this might be a good time for us to take a break, before you get into the substantive testimony.

MR. COLE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll take our next break, ladies and gentlemen. Remember my instructions not to discuss the matter, or form or express any opinions. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.)

THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands in recess subject to call.

(A recess was taken.)

(State's Exhibits 122 through

150 were marked for identification.)

THE COURT: Before we get the jury in here, Mr. Russo kindly complied with the Court's order and gave me a copy of some documents. One is a letter to Mr. Russo from George Patkin (PH) with an attachment. Two numbered paragraphs on and another attachment, that indicates there's recognition of low-level alcohol intoxication from speech signal. A two-page document.

I reviewed that in chambers. I told Mr. Russo

Mr. Madson \_\_\_\_\_ document that I would normally

provide over to the other side and Mr. Madson -- I said,

however, if you object, we can put it on the record. Mr.

Madson indicated some sort of objection to me turning this

over to Mr. Cole, so you can put that on the record at this

time, Mr. Madson.

MR. MADSON: Well, first of all, Your Honor, Rule 16 says -- relates only to reports from experts, which may be disclosed to the prosecution upon order of the Court. This, first of all, is not a report.

Secondly, it's from experts that you intend to use at trial. We don't know if we need to use him or not. Since he was retained and consulted only because the State said we want -- they intended to rely upon, or use experts in this unknown big field of recognition of intoxication by

spectogram.

So as a result, we contacted him. The letter he wrote back, the one the Court has there, is in response to Mr. Russo's conversations with him in which he asked him opinions and also whether or not he could do, or could not do, certain things. That's certainly within the -- the scope of the attorney privilege. It's a work product. It isn't a report.

At that time, he said, "Here's my fees. Here's basically what I think I can do." He hasn't done it. We don't know if it can be done, and we don't even know if we need to -- we intend to use him or not. He is a backup in case the Court decides to go with a Fry hearing, or with a hearing on the merits on this.

So it doesn't come at all within Rule 16.

THE COURT: All right. This is marked as Court's Exhibit 5?

THE CLERK: Yes, sir.

(Court's Exhibit 5was marked for identification.)

THE COURT: Okay. We've marked it for identification for the record, and we'll keep it as a part of the record, as Court's Exhibit 5.

And your objection is noted. Mr. Cole, you can approach the bench. I'm overruling the objection. And if

j

we do end up having a Fry hearing on this, this will be helpful for everybody to have in advance of the Fry hearing. It will prevent any unnecessary delays on the Fry hearing, too.

MR. MADSON: Then Your Honor, I think the same ruling should apply to the State, and we should be entitled to every bit of correspondence, phone notes and everything else that they've had with any expert, whether or not they intend to call him or not.

THE COURT: Your request is denied.

Are we ready now with the jury?

MR. COLE: Judge, I just wanted to mention that there's been a stipulation reached between the parties, and I'll approach the Court. Just as to business records, and the information contained in this package is business records.

THE COURT: Should we have this marked as one exhibit, then? State's exhibit?

MR. COLE: Well, actually, it says three exhibits there.

THE COURT: Have they been marked?

MR. COLE: No they have not.

THE COURT: Okay. What have been the next three numbers in order?

THE CLERK: (Inaudible) 151, 152 and 153.

THE COURT: Is there a stipulation as to the admissibility of these documents, 151, two and three as business records.

MR. MADSON: Not admissibility, Your Honor. Just that they're business records.

THE COURT: Okay. So the hearsay objection is --

MR. MADSON: That's right.

THE COURT: -- is overcome.

MR. MADSON: They are business records, and we have so stipulated.

THE COURT: Okay. So we don't have a hearsay objection. There may be a relevancy objection.

MR. MADSON: That's correct, or other objections.

THE COURT: Or other objections. Okay.

(State's Exhibits 151, 152

and 153 were marked for

identification.)

THE COURT: Are we ready now with the jury?

MR. COLE: Yes. We would just like to take the data up at some point. We don't have to do it right now. We're ready to go.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so, Mr. Madson, you understand my ruling, I've ordered the State to comply with criminal rule 16. If you have any specific examples where they are not complying if you will bring it to my

\_

attention, I will issue some remedial orders. Your broad request, every letter, note, conversation, things like that, will be in general denied, but you have specific requests in the future, please bring them to my attention, and I will address them as they come up. But broad requests like that will be -- will be denied.

MR. MADSON: Well, specifically, all correspondence, whether the report or not. That's what our letter as, and I think they must have some in their files, too.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole, let's address that now.

There's -- this witness, now, Mr. Greiner, has been going over a -- it looks like a vitae of some sort of his credentials. Did you have that available to you before this witness was called?

MR. COLE: I did, and I provided copies of all the curriculum vitae of the witnesses that we received, and that was given to them when we gave them copies -- notice of our expert witnesses.

THE COURT: Okay. All witnesses that you intend on calling, your expert witnesses, you understand that you're under the order of the rule in this court to produce any summaries, letters, notes of conversations that reflect what the witness would testify to, any documentation the witness has provided you, including any publications that a

witness has created, any books he's written, any -anything he's provided you that would go to his credentials
as an expert. So you understand that?

MR. COLE: I have one that I received last night that is a letter from Captain Beevers, and I'll provide that today.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well.

Let's bring the jury in.

(Whereupon, the jury enters the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Chalos, these are extra copies -I don't need these -- of the witness, proposed witness
Patcom (PH). Thanks.

(Pause)

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. You may resume, Mr. Cole.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Captain Greiner, what -- after being hired by the state of Alaska in this matter, what evidence have you reviewed prior to coming into court today?

A I've reviewed a large number of things. I have a table of contents of information that was sent to me by your office. It involves the NTSB transcripts, their exhibits, with the exception that some of the exhibits were not enclosed, and they were listed as not available.

Certain trooper's statements, certain statements

1 taken by the Coast Guard. 2 I've gotten vessel records, maneuvering data off 3 of the bridge, bell log, bell logger, course recorder, log I don't know how much detail you want me to go books. 5 into. Q Fine. 7 MR. CHALOS: Judge, could we approach the bench a second? THE COURT: All right. 10 (The following was had at the bench:) 11 MR. CHALOS: Judge \_\_\_\_ witness is 12 referring to (inaudible). THE COURT: How do you know if you haven't seen 13 14 it? MR. CHALOS: \_\_\_\_\_ particular list that he's 15 referring to. 16 17 (Inaudible remarks) THE COURT: Does he -- has he been given things 18 by the State that have not been provided to the Defendant? 19 MR. COLE: (Inaudible). 20 THE COURT: (Inaudible) cross-examination I will 21 let you (inaudible). 22 (The following was had in open court:) 23 BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 24 In addition to this information, did you visit Q 25

١.

the Exxon Valdez at any time?

- A Yes, sir. I visited it three times.
- Q Would you tell the jury when you visited the Exxon Valdez?

A The first time, I believe it was the 2nd of April. The Exxon Valdez at that time was still on Bligh Reef. The second time -- I believe it was in June. I don't have a specific date. At that time, the vessel was at anchor in a bay at Naked Island. And the third time was in September when the vessel was in dry dock, and that was in San Diego.

Q Why did you go to the Exxon Valdez on the 2nd, '89? March, April 2nd?

A I went there in company with some of the -- with an attorney -- I think it was Trooper Fox. It was one of the troopers. We went there to obtain records from the vessel under a subpoena. And to examine the vessel in general, just get a general feel for the vessel.

Q And in June of 1989, why did you go to the vessel at that time?

A We did a text on the rudder. I was interested in how the rudder behaved and specifically the steering console, whether, for instance, the -- if it was in automatic pilot, would an alarm sound, or would the rudder turn if he turned the wheel? And that was the primary

reason. In both cases, we oriented ourselves with regard to the equipment on the bridge.

Q And the third time you visited the Exxon Valdez, that was in dry dock?

A Yes, sir. That was down in San Diego on the grading dock, and we took photographs. Hugh Ackroyd, a photographer from my area and I, went down and, in company with Bill Milwee, an attorney from your office, an attorney representing Exxon, Bill Vorhus — I think that was all of us that were there, we inspected the bottom, looked at it, analyzed it, and photographed it.

Q Would you explain how a vessel the size of the Exxon Valdez gets placed in dry dock?

A In this particular dock, which is a grading dock, there — there are basically two types of dry dock. One is a floating dry dock, where they flood the dock and sink it, and then put the vessel on it.

In a grading dock is a dock that is built into the earth. In other words, it doesn't go up and down. The gates are closed. They pump it — they fill it with water, they open the gates, they move the vessel in, and close the gate, and then pump the water out, as opposed to a floating dry dock, where they pump the water, not out of the water surrounding the vessel, but out of the dock itself, and it fills up and it lifts the vessel with it.

Now, I'd like to talk about the damage that you

1

itself?

1 !

 A I -- no, I'm not. I mean, there is a superstructure, and there is piping on deck, and there are winches and things like that that are -- they're manifolds and piping. Now, what I said is that everything isn't there, and I gave you an example that the rails weren't there and, in fact, all -- you've pointed out some other things that aren't there. That's true. Everything isn't there.

MR. CHALOS: Now, Judge, the pressure vacuum valves and the inert gas system are indeed, and have been, important elements of this case. I would think that any model that omits them being represented as being a fair and accurate model of the ship would not be accurate and, for that reason, I would ask that it not be admitted into evidence as a fair and accurate representation of the vessel.

THE COURT: I think you've pointed out some of the absences, and that's made clear. You can argue that effect. I'm going to overrule your objection. The model comes in.

(State's Exhibit 154 was received in evidence.)

## DIRECT EXAMINATION -- Resumed

BY MR. COLE:

Q Now, would you point out for the jury where the

,

center cargo tanks are on the bottom of this vessel?

A I'm not sure what you mean by center cargo tanks, because -- you're talking about the longitudinal ones?

- Q Yes.
- A Yes. Okay. I'll do it this way.
- Q Sure.

A The center tanks are down the center of the vessel. Basically, there are three tanks across. You have the center tanks, port tanks and the starboard tanks.

Q And which one is the starboard side, and which one are the port?

A The starboard side is the right side. The port side is the left side. Port and left have the same number of letters in them and that's how I remembered it when I started.

Q Now, would you describe for the jury the damage that you observed through the center cargo area, the center line of the vessel?

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the word "damage," because there's been evidence that some of this -- some of the plating was cut while the vessel was en route to San Diego. I wouldn't consider that to be damage. I think the more proper question is, just have him describe what he saw rather than characterize it as damage.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole.

ς.

MR. CHALOS: Damage just means damage, Judge. I don't see anything improper by using that language. It's damage to the bottom of the vessel.

THE COURT: Will you be able to distinguish between damage that may have arisen as a result of the grounding, and damage which arose as a result of repairs?

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll let you cross-examine the witness on that. I'm going to let the witness testify as to what he saw.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q What did you see down the center -- the center line of the vessel?

A Basically, this being the front of the bow, the damage started just a little to the left of the bow and went down through the center line and diagonal, and ended somewhere in this area here. I'd like to explain that from here aft, by the superstructure, after you have engineering compartments and such like that, the tanks end at this area here, and I'm talking about forward of the house.

There's a pump room in there, but, for all intents and purposes, this is all tanks, and this is machinery or living area in here.

The damage ended on the starboard side prior to reaching the pump room, which is immediately forward of the

5

engine room.

Q Now, you can set that down there.

I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number Number 103.

Do you recognize that diagram?

- A Yes, sir. I do.
- Q And what is that a diagram of?
- O That is a diagram of the portion of the Exxon Valdez forward of the engine room. In other words, the portion from here, forward. And I'm pointing to the area of the Exhibit 154, which is where the superstructure, the forward part of the superstructure.
- A And there are numerous lines running vertically across this diagram. What are those?
  - A Those are frames.
  - Q What's a frame?
- A These are structural members. In other words, the vessel is made up of planks and structural members. It's a structural member that runs transfers or from side to side on the vessel. They're also some longitudinal, which means they run the length of the vessel.
- Q And there is certain indications of squiggly lines and such lettering that's on this. What is that?
- A These are the indications of damage placed on them for the salvage crew. They came from divers. In

}

. \_

other words, it was information that was acquired from divers during the salvage operation. And the drawing itself was obtained from the salvage master, Mickey Leitz (PH).

Q And did the damage that you see drawn on this correspond with the damage that you observed when you looked at the Exxon Valdez at dry dock?

A The damage in dry dock is probably more extensive than is on this exhibit. Part of that is because additional plates were missing. Part of it is because this was done as an underwater survey, and there are things that divers just don't pick up.

Q But to the extent that it notes the damage, does that fairly and accurately represent what you saw?

A Yes, sir.

O Now, there are a number of numbers with arrows placed across this damage diagram. What are those?

A These are numbers that I placed on there that represent the photograph that was taken at that place. In other words, there's a two digit — there's a number, a dash and another number. The first number is the roll of the film. The second number is the negative of the film. The arrow is the direction the camera was facing at that point.

Q And do those numbers correspond to pictures that

you've brought into court here today?

Y

Too, entities dot

A Yes, sir. They do.

Q How do they correspond to those pictures?

A The photograph that has the same number on the back of it as is shown on Exhibit 103 is the photograph that was taken where the number appears on Exhibit 103. In other words, the back of the photograph will have 8-10 on it, and if you look at Exhibit 103, you will find 8-10, and that's where that photograph was taken.

Q And, at the bottom of the diagram, there are indications of damage that was done to the starboard side. Would you explain what that was?

A The starboard side sustained substantial damage as the result of the tide going out. In other words, when the tide went out, and the vessel sat heavier on it, it — it squashed, basically. And this is illustrative of the damage that was noted in the very righthand side of the vessel, the starboard side of the vessel.

Q And was that damage observed by you when you inspected the Exxon Valdez in dry dock?

A Yes, sir. It was.

MR. COLE: Your Honor, I would move for the admission of what's been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 103.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, may I have a short voir

} ||

THE COURT: Short, yes.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MR. CHALOS:

- Q Mr. Greiner, you say that when you viewed the ship down in San Diego, that the damage you observed was more extensive than the damage that's shown in this diagram?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Because there had been plates cut away?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - O And you didn't prepare this particular diagram?
- A I didn't prepare the diagram itself. I believe Mr. Hudson, who's sitting in the courtroom, prepared --
  - O No. My question was, you didn't prepare it?
- A I prepared the numbers on it. Not the diagram itself.
- O So you don't know if that diagram accurately reflects the condition of the vessel at the time that the diagram was made?
- A No, sir As I indicated, it probably didn't, because everything -- all the damage couldn't have been picked up and put on there. It's a fair representation on it, but it isn't down to the little engine --
  - Q But you don't have any personal knowledge of

5

3

7

8

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

9

11

12

13

15

16

12

10

20

21

22 23

24

25

it's very unprofessional for you to turn around and you and Mr. Russo engage in conduct that expresses your displeasure with my ruling. I've noticed that several times. I don't want to bring it up in front of the jury, but it's not necessary.

MR. CHALOS: All right.

THE COURT: Okay, sir.

(Inaudible remarks)

(The following was had in open court:)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Now, Captain Greiner, can you indicate on this diagram where the bow is, and where the \_\_\_\_\_ is?

A Yes, sir. This is the bow, the front end of the vessel, and the stern, the end of the vessel, is not shown on here. If you remember, I indicated that this part here represented this part of the vessel here, so the diagram shows the portion of the vessel forward, and I've been referring to Exhibit 154.

- Q Would you show the jury where the forepeak of this vessel is?
  - A Yes, sir. It's right here.
- Q And which side is the starboard side and which side is the port side?
- A The starboard side, or the right side, is down.

  The port side is up. You're basically looking down on the

vessel, like this.

O Now, would you point out to the jury where the damage that was done to the center line began?

A Damages to the center line began both to the left and right, or the port and starboard, of the center line, right in this area here. The bow, of course -- it's right here. Just right in the forepeak area.

Q And where did it go from there?

A It moves aft, slightly diagonal across the vessel. In other words, let me lay my pointer down as to the center line of the damage that I'm now describing, and that's -- that basically is it. You can see, it starts center, on the center line, but a little to the left, as well as to the right, and it ends all on the starboard side aft.

Q Now, would you describe -- is there a way that you can tell that all of that damage was done -- is there any indication that that type of damage was done in a continuous period of time? Or, you know, at the same time?

A The -- let me characterize the damage. The damage was done by running over a very solid object, assumed to be a rock, or rocks, that started here, moved aft, and passed behind the vessel. In other words, the object, or objects, that made this tearing of the bottom of the hull, ended up behind the vessel, before it was finally

stopped.

Q And if a person was looking in this -- stand over here -- in this area right in here, on the bottom of the vessel, what -- what -- would you describe what you would see going down the vessel?

A In this area here, if you're standing just forward of the vessel, and you're looking aft, basically you see what -- I guess I can describe it as a tunneling effect. In other words, you can see that the damage, looking in this direction, and looking aft, that the damage is higher in the center than it is on either side.

- Q Would you step up to the chart, to the board, and draw a picture of what the -- an outline -- (inaudible).
  - A Yes, sir. I'm getting trapped here.
    (Pause)
  - Q Just describe for them that tunnel effect.

A This is looking from the bow, the fore part of the ship, aft. And the damage appeared in this pattern. Obviously, it was torn and such, but there seemed -- you could look down there, and you see a tunnel. Not a high tunnel, but a tunnel effect, to indicate where the damage, or the rock, had passed -- actually, it's the reverse. The rock stood still -- where the vessel passed over the rock.

Q Now, what damage did you observe at the -- toward the starboard end, toward the stern, at this end?

A There was score marks running fore and aft in the afterpart down here. There were -- just forward to that, there was -- the hull was torn, the plates of the hull were torn, but at the very end, it was scratch marks from the rock.

Q What does scored mean?

A Scored means basically when an impervious material is -- has a ridge in it that's caused by another object.

MR. COLE: Judge, I'm going to ask at this time if we could move it a little bit further. I'm going to be using these pictures to show the damage that's set out in this diagram.

THE COURT: Assuming they're going into evidence, that's okay.

MR. COLE: We'll go through that right now.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Captain Greiner, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 133. Do you recognize that photograph?

(Pause)

(Pause)

Do you recognize that?

- A Yes, sir. I recognize the photograph.
- Q What is that a photograph of?

25

24

21

22

23

A This is a photograph of the Exxon Valdez, a portion of it.

Q Where is this photograph taken?

A The photograph is taken -- let me look at the number on the back of it again -- is taken aft, looking forward. If I might suggest, I think when the -- I think that when the tags were put on them, they were put in the reverse order from what I had them before, so that --

(Pause)

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 125. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what is that a diagram of?

A That's a photograph of the Exxon Valdez forward looking aft.

Q Is that an accurate representation of the Exxon Valdez in that particular point, as you observed it?

A Yes, sir. It is.

Q Now, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 126. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q And what is that a photograph of?

A It's a photograph of the Exxon Valdez, the bottom

24

25

of it, the forward section, and it's photographed on 9-7.

Q And where is that taken?

A 9-7 is taken right on the center line, right here.

- Q Does that photograph accurately represent what you observed when you saw the Exxon Valdez in dry dock?
  - A Yes sir. It does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 128. Do you recognize that?
  - A Yes, sir, I do.
  - Q What is that a photograph of?
- A A different portion of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez.
  - Q Which portion of that was that?
- A This is -- sorry. This is photograph 7-27, which was taken here, looking aft.
- Q Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were at that point?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 127. Do you recognize that?
  - A Yes, sir, I do.
  - Q And what's that a photograph of?

recognize that photograph?

25

observed when you were at that place?

Does that accurately represent the image that you

23

24

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

19

20

21

. 22

23

A Yes, sir. It does.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 132. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, sir, I do. It's a photograph of the Exxon Valdez bottom.

Q And where was that photograph taken?

A That was taken right here, and again, it's facing aft.

Q And does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in that position?

A Yes. sir, it does.

Q Now, finally, showing you what has been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 133, do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q And what's that a photograph of?

A That's a photograph of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez. It's taken at this position here, and it's facing forward. Most of the photographs are facing aft. This one's facing forward. And it --

Q Does that fairly and accurately represent the scene that you saw when you were at that particular point?

A Yes, sir, it does.

(Pause)

when you were in that position?

Yes, sir.

1

24

24

25

Q Now, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 135. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir. This is a photograph of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it was taken at this location here. In this particular instance, you'll notice that the arrow faces at about the angle shown by my pointer. It's not facing aft.

Q Is that a -- was that photograph taken while you were in San Diego?

A Yes, sir.

O And does it accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in that position?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 136. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir. I recognize this as a photograph that was taken in my presence when I was in San Diego, and it was taken at this location, facing aft.

Q And does that accurately reflect what you observed at that time?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q While in San Diego?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q Now, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 137. Do you recognize that document?

A Yes, sir. It was a photograph taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it was taken at this location, facing aft.

- Q And was -- is that accurately reflect what you observed at that point?
  - A Yes, sir, it is.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 138. Do you recognize that photograph?
- A Yes, sir, I do. It's a photograph that was taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it was taken at this location right here, facing aft.
- Q And does that accurately represent the damage that you observed when you were in that position?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 139. Do you recognize that photograph?
- A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez. Again, this is a photograph not taken in the normal course. It was taken looking from the right to the left instead of aft on the

vessel.

Q And does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego that day?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 140. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, sir. I do. This is a photograph of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it was taken in my presence at this location here. This one also looks from the right side to the left side of the vessel.

O Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego on that particular date?

- A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q From that point.

I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 141. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it was taken at this location in the number two starboard tank face -- looking aft. The camera was looking aft.

Q Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego that day?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 142. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir. This is a photograph taken in San

Diego of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez and -- in my

presence, and was taken -- this -- at this location, facing

aft.

- O Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego that day in that particular place?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 143. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do. It's a photograph taken in my presence in San Diego of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it's taken at this location here, center of the number two starboard tank, looking aft.

Q And does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego that day in dry dock?

A Yes, sir.

Q \_\_\_\_\_ that point?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 144. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir. It's a photograph taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez in San Diego, and it's taken at this location here, looking aft.

- Q And does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in San Diego that day?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what has been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 145. Do you recognize that document?

A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph taken in my presence in San Diego of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and it's taken at this point here, on the starboard side, looking aft.

- Q Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed in that photograph?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 144. Do you recognize that photograph?
- A Yes, sir, I do. It's a photograph taken in my presence in San Diego of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez and it's taken in this location right here, looking aft.

, --

Q Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were standing in that place while you were in San Diego?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 147. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph taken in my presence of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez in San Diego.

Again, this is not following the norm. This is from the center of the vessel, or very close to it, looking outboard, or looking away from the center line to the starboard side.

- Q Does that accurately reflect the damage that you observed when you were in that particular place that day?
  - A Yes, sir, it does.
- Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 148. Do you recognize that photograph?
- A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph of the Exxon Valdez taken in my presence in San Diego, and it was taken right here, at this location. The locations which I'm referring to are on Exhibit 103.
- Q Does that photograph -- does that exhibit accurately reflect the damage that you observed in that

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 149. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, sir, I do. This is an accurate photograph of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez taken in my presence while I was in San Diego, and it was taken at this location right here, facing aft.

Q Does that accurately reflect the view of the vessel that you observed when you were in that particular position when you were observing the Exxon Valdez in dry dock?

A Yes, sir, it does.

Q Finally, showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 150. Do you recognize that photograph?

A Yes, sir, I do. This is a photograph of the Exxon Valdez taken in my presence in San Diego and that is -- was taken at this location, facing aft.

Q Captain Greiner, did you take that last batch of photographs?

- A No sir, I didn't.
- Q Who did take those?
- A Hugh Ackroyd, a photographer who accompanied me

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Captain Greiner, let's start with what has been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 125. Would you show where that photograph was taken, and then briefly describe to the jury what they're looking at?

A This photograph was taken right here, just a little to the left of the center line, looking aft. You're seeing the initial markings where the vessel first came in contact with the bottom. The blocks that are underneath here are bilge blocks -- I'll mention them in --

- Q You need to hold that up --
- A I'm sorry.

The bilge blocks are these blocks right here, and they're approximately four foot high. This is what the vessel rests on. In other words, they're put in there before the vessel comes into the dry dock, and the vessel is — when the water is pumped out, the vessel comes down and sits on them. They're — I believe they're concrete blocks with a wood top on it, in other words, a crushing piece. And you'll see them throughout all the photographs.

Q Now, can I ask you to identify that position on this, also?

A It's right here. Let me -- let me hold the picture up. It's in this direction, in this location here, looking aft.

Q Now, showing you what's been identified -- what's been admitted as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 125, show the jury what that is a picture of, and where that was taken?

A This photograph --

Q Incidentally, before you do that, would you show the jury how you are identifying where these photographs were taken?

A Okay. The photograph on the back of it has a -has two tags. This is the Court's tag. This one is the
photographer's tag, and at the bottom, he has a series of
numbers. I assume that the first five digits, or numbers,
are his case number, and we're only interested in the last
grouping, and in this particular photograph, it's R, which
stands for roll, 9, dash 7, which is the negative.

The A after it is because, on 35 millimeter film, they'll have a number 7 and a little over to the right, they'll have a 7A in case the roll is loaded just a little out of the normal frame. So the last letter can be disregarded. It's, in this case, negative 7, and it's taken right here.

Q So that would be roll 9, negative 7.

A Yes, sir. You can always match them up by looking at this number, with the number that's on here.

Q Would you show the -- tell the -- that's upside down, I believe, right?

Q Would you show -- would you tell the jury now what that is a photograph of?

A This is a photograph of -- this is the center line of the vessel, as you can see, and this is another area of initial contact. Here's a ladder here. The plate's been ruptured and there's a ladder there so that workmen can go in, and there are some hoses there.

It's a wide angle lens, so there's a little distortion. You can see it at the edges.

Q Would you point out other areas that the jury will see photographs of later, so that they can keep this in -- understand where they are in other photographs?

A Right here is an area where you will see a rock, a large rock, about the size of a Volkswagen, imbedded in the bottom of the vessel. This photograph, which was taken later than the photographs of the rock you'll see, there is a sign. That sign is not present in the other ones. We're talking about a matter of hours. But this sign right here is a cautionary sign for no one to walk under it, because they are afraid it might fall out.

Q Would you point out, in that photograph, where the forepeak is?

A The forepeak -- this is the forepeak area, right here.

Q I'm showing you number -- Exhibit Number 128. Would you show the jury what that is a picture of?

A Okay. I'm looking at the back of it. It's photograph 7-27, and it is taken just a little to the right of the center line back here, and on this exhibit, on 103, the pink lines represent the separations between the tanks. So that there -- you know, this is number one tank center. This is number two tank center. Three, four, five.

And so this represents the damage in this area right here. You're looking at the damage -- as you look at the photograph, here is -- I believe this is the bulkhead between the two tanks, right here. That would be the bulkhead, right here between the number one and the number two tank.

Normally, there would be plating here. You wouldn't see any of this. But the plating is missing from the area, and what you're looking at, is you're looking at the structural members, which I mentioned before are these members here that are in the vessel, that hold the plating in place.

These are the bilge blocks here. And the light here is because the shipyard had put lights underneath it. That's nothing of -- just provided light.

Q Now, why isn't there the bottom cover, the plate

A Well, the plates are missing. Whether the plates were torn out in the initial contact, or whether the plates were torn out at a later date, I can't tell. We know that there was a lot of damage done in the initial contact, but there's no way that I have to identify which plates were there after the initial contact and were later cut off, or which plates were missing after the initial contact.

Q And finally, would you just show the jury on this -- using this model -- where this photograph was taken.

A Okay, this photograph -- on the model, it's difficult to see, but the person who made the model made the bulkheads between the tanks a little thicker than the pieces that represent the structural members, and -- so here is the bulkhead between the two tanks.

The photograph is taken underneath, on the bottom, right in here, facing aft. Turn it over? In other words, it's taken right here, looking aft.

Q Would you show the judge that real quick? He's in a bad place.

(Pause)

Number 127?

A Number 127 is photograph 9-1, and it's taken here, underneath the number one center tank. And it represents -- these are score marks here that we talked

. .

7

10

11 12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

25

about before, and of course, here your plating has been ripped out. Again, the bilge blocks are right here.

#### Number 129?

129 is photograph 7-9, taken in this location, under the number 3 center tank -- this is number 3 center tank. And this was taken -- the person in it is me. gives you an idea of the size, the magnitude that we're talking about, here. The reason I was in it is I was shooting a flashgun off at that point so we'd have better -- a better photograph.

Now, what is this, in this area right in here?

This is a crushing effect, and not a tearing In other words, in this area, as we'll discuss effect. later, there is a twelve-foot rise and fall of the tide. So when the vessel is on the bottom at high tide, and the tide goes out, it's -- it's going to try to go down, but the rocks there, you're going to get crushing damage underneath there.

#### Now, number 130?

130 is photograph 823, which is taken underneath the number 4 center tank in this area here. You can see the scoring marks. You can see the -- on the photograph itself, the marks that the rock left as the vessel passed over it. In other words, this is a very good indication that -- of the vessel's movement here.

•

1:30.

Q Of the vessel going over something?

A Yes. The vessel going over the rock. It indicates the direction that the vessel was going at that time. The person in it is the attorney for Exxon.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole, I think we'll stop. It's

MR. COLE: Sure.

THE COURT: That completes the trial day. We'll resume again at 8:15 a.m. on Monday. This is Friday, so you'll have two days, the weekend. Don't discuss this case among yourselves or with any other person, and do not form or express any opinions concerning the case.

Avoid the media information about this case, or media information about the oil spill in any regard, involving any of this, the people involved, or the companies involved. I've told you that enough times. I don't need to go into detail. But I just want to emphasize its importance.

So have a safe weekend, and we'll see you back at 8:15 a.m. on Monday.

(Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Is there anything I can do for counsel before we recess?

MR. COLE: I'll provide the stuff that we mentioned up there, Judge, as far as that information that

\_

11

. .

14

15

17

18

19

2021

it.

22

23

24

· <del>-2</del>5

we've -- of what we've sent Captain Greiner, and any reports that he's done for this, we'll turn it over today.

MR. CHALOS: Judge, yes. I notice that Mr. Greiner has a blue book in front of them that he keeps referring to. I think it would speed up my cross-examination if I were allowed to review it, either tomorrow or Sunday. This way I can eliminate a lot of the questions relating to the document in front of him.

THE COURT: Are you using that book in any way to assist you in your --

THE WITNESS: The book contains a number of the --

(Pause)

The book contains a number of the exhibits that are present in the court, and it also contains a spreadsheet that I worked out myself in doing the reconstruction, and a few other things that are not exhibits in the court.

THE COURT: Any problem with that?

MR. : I don't have any problem with

THE COURT: Okay. Well, you want to have it some time before your cross-examination. You'll expect to finish up in a couple of hours on Monday?

MR. COLE: Yes.

′

O

THE COURT: Well, sometime between now and your cross-examination, Captain Greiner, would you let Mr. Chalos look over it in your presence?

THE WITNESS: Certainly.

THE COURT: You don't have to turn to him. He can do it in your presence.

THE WITNESS: Certainly.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I do have one other matter. Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 120 and 121, which are the two tapes that were brought in by the Coast Guard personne: this morning, I didn't have them until he brought them in this morning myself, and the defense has requested copies of those. They already have a copy of the complete tape, but they would like to have a copy of those portions that I have specifically requested.

So I would request permission to take those tapes from the courtroom -- they have not been admitted. I have not moved to admit them yet -- so that I can make copies for us and for the defense.

THE COURT: Any problem allowing that to be done? Okay. Then you can do that.

MR. COLE: There's one exhibit, Your Honor, that I would like to withdraw, and that is what has been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 28. It's merely a

MR. : All of us, or just one --THE COURT: I think all of you should come up. 2 Ms. Henry? 3 (The following was had at the bench:) 5 THE COURT: I don't know how that article in the paper about the speech (inaudible) all seen that this morning in the paper, but it's not in evidence, and I don't 7 if counsel, do you want \_\_\_\_\_ release that information to the press? MR. : No, sir. 10 11 MR. : (Inaudible). THE COURT: Okay. Nobody here releases 12 information to the press (inaudible). I just want to make 13 sure that (inaudible). Okay. I didn't think either one of 14 you had, but I wanted to be sure. 15 (The following was had in open court:) 16 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else we can 17 18 do before we recess for the weekend? MR. No. 19 THE COURT: Have a nice weekend. We'll see you 20 Monday. 21 THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands in 22 recess, subject to call. 23 (Whereupon, at 1:34 p.m., the hearing recessed.) 24

**V**(

SUPERIOR COURT )
Case No. 3ANS89-7217
STATE OF ALASKA ) Case No. 3ANS89-7218

I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was typed by me and that said transcript is a true record of the recorded proceedings to the best of my ability.

alexandra Jornalories
ALEXANDRA TOMALONIS

### VOLUME 18

#### STATE OF ALASKA

## IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AT ANCHORAGE

In the Matter of:

STATE OF ALASKA

Case No. 3ANS89-7217

versus

Case No. 3ANS89-7218

JOSEPH J. HAZELWOOD

Anchorage, Alaska February 26, 1990

The above-entitled matter came on for trial by jury before the Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, commencing at 8:36 a.m. on February 26, 1990. This transcript was prepared from tapes recorded by the Court.

## APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the State:

BRENT COLE, Esq.

MARY ANN HENRY, Esq.

On behalf of the Defendant:

DICK L. MADSON, Esq.

MIKE CHALOS, Esq.

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.

Professional Transcription Service
(202) 347-5395

3

1

2

5 |

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

# CONTENIS

2	WITNESSES							
3	STATE'S				DIRECT	CROSS	REDIREC	T RECROSS
4	George K.	Greiner,	Jr.		3	68	140	150
5						-	162	164
6				-				
7								
8				<u>E</u> <u>X</u> <u>H</u>	<u>I</u> <u>B</u> <u>I</u> <u>T</u>	<u>s</u>		
9	DEFENDANT	<u>'s</u>		_	<u>IDEN</u>	TIFICA	TION IN	N EVIDENCE
10	V-AB					49		-
11					•			
12	STATE'S							
13	16					-		29
14	17		, .			-		36
15	122					-		52
16	123					-		17
17	124					_		17
18	155					-		45
19	156					57		59
20	157				•	148		_
21								
22								
23								
24					ı			
25					ļ			
			•					

# PROCEEDINGS

(Tape C-3640)

(Whereupon, the jury enters the courtroom.)

THE CLERK: -- Karl S. Johnstone now presiding.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You may be seated. I really appreciate you folks being on time. That really assists us. We'll resume with Captain Greiner's testimony. Your still under oath, sir.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. COLE: Can he come forward again, Your Honor? Whereupon,

GEORGE K. GREINER, JR.

having been called as a witness by Counsel for the State, and having previously been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Now, Captain Greiner, we were talking -- when we left off, we left off at Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 131. Would you show the jury where that photograph was taken again?

A That was taken right here, near the center line of the vessel, looking aft.

Q Now what are we observing in that photograph?

A This is part of the tunneling that we were talking about before and these are the score marks that run down

the length of the vessel. We're looking aft, in this direction here.

Q And those score marks are an indication of what?

A Rock having passed -- the vessel having passed over rock or some such substance.

Q And real briefly, just to -- real quickly, explain how you got -- where that picture was taken from again.

A The picture numbers on the back here, the last few digits, R8 means the roll and 19 is the negative number of that roll and that matches the number here, 819.

Q Now Exhibit Number 132?

A This is 8-15, this is a little further aft. And it's taken a little further outboard to starboard to the righthand side of the vessel, this again being the bow, and it's looking aft. And again you can see the score marks here. These bilge blocks, which I mentioned to you before which support the vessel, the vessel rests on them, go in a straight line, generally, from bow to the stern. There are a number of them across here. So you can see the diagonal effect, the five-degree diagonal effect that I had talked about earlier.

Q Now at this point, would you point out what the light is in the back there so the people can get an idea of that?

A Yes, this is daylight. In other words, we're

looking out from underneath the vessel and this is all the way out, beyond the vessel.

Q Now one thing I'd like you to talk about is what this line right here represents on the diagram.

A May I use the model?

Q Sure.

A As we move aft on the bottom of the vessel, we no longer have a square bottom, in other words, the top sides and the bottom here. It starts to fair out and you can see the shape of it there. And this represents the shape of the stern which starts actually well forward of the deck house. That's what these lines represent in here.

Q Now Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 133, where was that photograph taken?

A 133 is the aftermost photograph taken and it is looking forward, instead of aft. The light at the end is all the way at the bow this time. And this shows the scrapes coming out the other side of the bilge blocks that we looked at in the previous drawing -- I'm sorry, photograph.

Q Now you indicated that there had been some crushing effect from the tides going up and down --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- in the damage that you saw -

A Yes, sir.

- Q -- in this area right in here.
- A Yes.
- Q Did you see any crushing effect where the bottom -- the stern of the vessel was touching ground?

A No, it did not appear here that this portion of the vessel was touching bottom when the tide went out and up and, therefore, as the vessel finally rested, this part here would not have been touching bottom.

- Q You would have expected to see some type of damage like that if it had been touching bottom.
- A Yes, the weight of the vessel would have caused an indentation, a large indentation, of the plate, as well as the structural members behind it.
- Q And was this characteristic, this damage right here, characteristic of the type of damage that was observed in this back portion?
  - A Yes, it was.
  - Now Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 134?
- A This is Photograph 93 and it's taken up forward in this location right here. In other words, the first series of photographs took you down the center line and then off to the starboard side aft. We're now starting further over, further to the right of the vessel, and we're going to go back through the same thing. This is again scoring and it does not seem to have any crushing here. It's

1

3 4

5

6 7

8

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

> 24 25

certainly indented and torn, but it doesn't have any of the crushing that we'll see further aft here.

Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 135?

This is Photograph 4-21 and it's taken right Α here. This is taken with quite a wide angle lens. Note that it is not facing exactly aft. We're looking inboard. And here, for the first time, appears the rock in the lefthand corner that you're going to see. This is outboard. When you're here, since it's on the lefthand side, it's over in this section here and we'll have other photographs of it later.

Now these two photographs right here, Number 1-36 Q and 1-37, would you describe where those are?

These two photographs show the rock, right here and right here, and they are taken -- 23 and 25, they're these two photographs taken right here, 25 being the lower one, being this one here, and 23 being a little further upward, being this one here.

Was there a ladder in that one?

Well, they're taken at different times. the ladder on this one may be actually out of the picture to the left, but some of these were taken at different These are consecutive, almost consecutive in the roll number, so they would have been taken about the same I assume the ladder is out of the picture to the

3 Δ

5

6 7

10

12

11

13 14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

left.

Now just discuss this 139 and give the jury a Q sense of how big this vessel is.

Okay, this is photograph R -- I'm sorry, 419. 419 is taken right here and it's looking from the starboard side of the vessel to the port side of the vessel. not looking fore and aft; it's looking in this direction. And you can see the people here. It gives you an idea of the size of the vessel. You know, we're not even anywhere near the main deck on this in looking at it.

Now Number 140, where was that taken? 0

140 is Photograph 5-13 and that is taken here. Again, it is looking across the ship, rather than fore and aft. It's looking from the righthand side of the ship to the lefthand side of the ship. This is scoring, tearing. Again, we don't see the large insets here that you'll see later on from the rise and fall of the vessel when it was on the rock. This indicates there was probably no rock here at the time when she came to rest. When I say no rock here, there's obviously rock below it, but no rock in contact with the vessel.

And that would be evidenced by the crushing effect if it were sitting on rock.

If it was sitting on the rock, yes, sir.

Now Number 141? 0

A This is 5-21. It's taken right here, looking aft, and we're now starting to see the crushing effect. This is the Number 2, in the way of Number 2 tank, and this is the area in here where I believe the vessel came to rest in contact with the rock.

#### Q Number 142?

A 142 is Photograph 9-32. And 9-32 is taken right at the side of the vessel, looking down the side of the vessel, and here you can see the crushing of what's called the turn of the bilge. The turn of the bilge is the rounded part of the hull which goes between the top side of the hull and the bottom. In other words, this portion right here is called the turn of the bilge. The bilge is the bottom of the vessel, inside, where the water accumulates or water — this is called the turn of the bilge.

This photograph shows the turn of the bilge.

That's this area right along here. And you can see the crushing effect in there from having rested on the rock and the tide going out and the weight of the vessel coming down on it.

Along the side here is the side of the graving dock. You'll notice that there isn't much clearance between the vessel and the side of the dock, just a few feet. And so all this structure here is the wall, the

side wall of the dock in which it sits.

Q And do Plaintiff's Exhibit 144 and 146 also show that?

A These are Photographs 9-34 and 39 -- I'm sorry, 34 and 37. They're taken side by side, right underneath the turn of the bilge, and they show similar effect to what we saw in the last photograph. They're just taken a little further aft.

Q Are they showing the -- can you point out the damage, the structural damage, to the underside, the bilge of the vessel?

A You can see the buckling in here along the turn of the bilge and in here, the members are pushed upward and this whole area in here is concave upward as a result of the contact with the rock after, in my opinion, after it had stopped.

Q Number 147?

A 147 is Photo 7-20 and 7-20 is taken right here. Now this is taken near the midships, but it's looking outboard, it's looking towards the righthand side of the vessel and you can see the crushing damage here. Now I'm not talking about tunnel fore and aft; I'm talking about looking from the center to the side of the vessel and this is all set in there as it rested on the rock.

Q Now when you were walking underneath this part of

the vessel, about how high was the vessel above the ground?

A I think it's a little less than four feet. I know that I got a sore back from walking hunched over all the time.

Q Give the jury an idea of what the type of height it was in the area in here under the bottom.

A In the area in which the photograph is taken, I could stand up and walk under it. As a matter of fact, there's a ladder here and, normally, ladders, the steps are one foot apart. So there's one, two, three, four, five, six there and it's a little higher in here.

Q Now Number 143, would you point out where that was taken from and describe the damage that's seen in that?

A 5-26 is taken right here. It's further in towards the center. Again, it's looking aft into the area that's crushed. This is the side of the graving dock here. We're looking dead aft. You're missing plates here. You're actually looking up into the tank itself. The gray background here is the -- I guess it's the bulkhead between the Number 2 and the Number 3 tanks. No, I'm sorry, this is a web frame. The bulkhead is shown right in this area here. It's back further than this area here. But you're missing your plate here. Here's the plate; it's torn off in this area here. And you have crushing in there.

Q What is this? What type of metal are we talking

about?

A We're talking about heavy steel. These are the channels that make up the longitudinal frames here. And I don't know what the thickness of them is, I didn't measure them, but they're heavy.

Q And Number 145?

A 145 is Photograph 5-32. 5-32 is taken here.

Again, we're looking at the crushed area and you can see how the frames, the longitudinal frames -- longitudinal means fore and aft, in this direction -- the longitudinal frames are pushed upward.

O And what are we seeing up in there, where the lights are?

A We're looking, again, up into the tank. There's ladders for the workmen to gain access from below into the tanks. This area right here where there's a light is a web frame, a very heavy frame that goes from left to right,

ship on the vessel. It's called the transverse frame. And this is a light inside the tank.

Q Now the last three photographs, would you just briefly describe where those are taken and what they show?

A These last three photographs are Photographs 8-5 here, 8-9 here and 5-36 here. These are all looking aft from the area that's crushed and as you can see, there is no crushing here. This is just scoring.

-

2

3 4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

And do you have an opinion on how that scoring got Q there?

Well, the vessel passed over a rock, but it did not sit on the rock in this area after it had stopped. Had it done that, it would have been crushed upwards. And, again, those photographs are taken -- I think 36 is -what's that one?

5-36. 0

That's taken here, in the middle of the Number 3 tank and the other two are aft of it.

Thank you, you can resume your seat. Q (Witness returns to his seat.) BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Now, Captain Greiner, do you have an opinion as to -- let's go back to the basics again. Do you have an opinion as to how the structural damage that you observed on the bottom of the Exxon Valdez occurred?

Α Yes, I do.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I'm going to object to any opinion that this witness may offer. He hasn't been qualified as a structural expert. He saw the damage. He can offer an opinion as to what he saw, but it would have to be a lay opinion, because as far as I remember from last Friday, Mr. Cole hasn't qualified Mr. Greiner as an expert in that area.

MR. COLE: I think that he talked about his background in the Coast Guard, working on tanker and vessel damage investigations and he's qualified to give an opinion about that.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Again, could you give the -- do you have an opinion on how the damage occurred?

A Yes, sir.

Q Would you tell the jury, using your pointer there, what that opinion is?

A There are two substantial series of damages. One is where the vessel passed over a rock or a series of rocks that caused damage in this area here. Those rocks were left astern of the vessel when it came to rest.

Q Wait a minute. What do you mean by "left astern of the vessel"?

A They were left. They passed and were back aft from the vessel, astern, behind the vessel when it finally stopped. There's a second series of rocks that it hit that it came to rest on and they are in this area here, and I'm showing the Number 2 and the Number 3 tanks. And the reason that I believe that they came to rest there is because of the crushing effect which you saw in the photographs that was created when the tide went out.

There's a tide rise and fall of about 12 feet in this area.

Q Explain to the jury how the vessel is affected by -- how the vessel was damaged by the tide going in and out.

A Well, the weight of the vessel is -- more of the weight of the vessel is supported by the rock and, therefore, it's crushed.

Q What happens when the tide goes out?

A The water level falls. You have shallower water over the rocks.

Q And what happens to the ship, to the vessel, when the water level falls?

A The vessel will take a list. In this particular instance, since the side is supported by the rocks, it can't sink any further because it's supported by the rocks, but the other side which is not supported by rocks can. We will go from a list from one side to the other. And as I understand from the testimony, it went from a two-degree port to a two-degree starboard list. When it was on the rock and you had high water, it would have a port list, a list to the left, and when -- I'm sorry, when you had low water, it would be supported by the rock and you'd have a list to the left.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 123 and Number 124. Do you recognize those exhibits?

i

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q Beginning with what's been identified as 123, would you tell the jury what that is, without showing it, just tell -- what is that?

A This is a tide graph, showing the rise and fall of the tide at Rocky Point. This is Rocky Point right here and I'm pointing to an exhibit which I guess is marked on the back. It's a chart of Prince William Sound. And this is where the vessel went aground. So the difference is from here to here. The coastal geodetic survey tide tables don't have the tide for every specific place in the United States; they only have it for specific places. And the closest one to where the vessel grounded is the one at Rocky Point and that's why I used that one.

Q How were those graphs that you have in front of you made?

A The graphs are computer generated. They're generated by Tide Graph International, who is a colleague of mine and who I furnished information to, and he prepared these on his computer.

Q And in the form that they are in, in this graph, is that a form that you typically rely upon in doing your work in the field of reconstruction?

A Yes, sir, it is.

Q And do they -- Number 123, what's the difference

.. 2

- 4

between Number 123 and 124?

A 123 is on the 24th of March, Friday, the 24th of March, and 124 is the previous day, which is the 23d of March.

MR. COLE: I would move for the admission of what's been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 123 and 124.

MR. CHALOS: No objection.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: They're both admitted.

(State Exhibits 123 and 124 were received in evidence.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q Would you tell the jury what the tide was at 12:00 o'clock that evening?
  - A May I hold this up and show them?
  - Q Show how it works.

A The graph represents zero — the heavy line at the bottom is what's called datum and that corresponds to the tide level at which soundings on a chart are taken, so that above and below zero, the soundings or the depth of water indicated by the soundings would be changed by the amount of tide that you had. At midnight, it was plus ten feet, so that in the area of Bligh Reef, if you had a sounding of 80 feet shown on the chart, it would actually have 90 feet of water there because you'd have to add the ten feet. The

6

11

12 13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

tide continued to rise for approximately two hours and, at about 2:00 o'clock in the morning, we had high tide and that was a tide of 12.4 feet, approximately. The exact figures I have elsewhere, but for our purposes, that's good enough.

The tide doesn't actually follow these. These are predicted ones and as close as you can get for predicted.

- When was the next low tide that morning?
- The next low tide was at, oh, between 8:00 and 8:30, right here, and it was at zero tide. So there's a difference of 12.4 feet down to zero, that's the difference of 12.4 feet.
- Okay, now back to the damage now. You talked about the first contact that the vessel had with the ground. How would that have affected the vessel's speed at that point?
  - It would have slowed it down considerably. A
  - And why is that? Q
- It's friction on the bottom of the vessel. Energy Α is absorbed in the tearing of the plates, the deformation of the bottom.
- Can you tell -- is there a way of telling exactly how long it took the vessel to pass over the first contact with the bottom?
  - No, there is not a way of telling exactly. It can

be estimated, but there is no way of telling exactly because no one knows how much energy was absorbed by the contact with the rock.

Q Can a person give an estimate as to approximately the amount of time?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Would you explain how that's done?

A The period of time to pass over the first rock would be -- well, the first rock would make contact with vessel somewhere in here and it would pass out from underneath the vessel about 800 feet aft of that, about in this area here. And so we're dealing with the time it takes for the vessel to move forward 800 feet, plus the length of whatever the rock was itself that was in contact with the bottom.

We know that the speed of the vessel before it started into the turn was about 12 knots and as it starts into the turn to the right, it slows down and I've estimated that it had a speed of about 11.4 knots when it first came in contact with the rock because it was in a turn.

An estimate, purely an estimate, of the speed when it passed over it, based on the slowing down of it, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6.6 knots. Now the manner in which I arrived at this, I didn't say it was 6.6 knots.

Я

I said, "Let's use an average of 9 knots as the speed that it was doing during this transit," for mathematical purposes. And when you use an average of nine knots, then you come out with 6.6 is the speed when it passes over, out behind the stern. And then it's a simple calculation as to speed, distance and time.

Q Before we get into that, then, how did the damage get done to the starboard side? Do you have an opinion on that?

A Yes. After the first rock passed, the first rock or rocks passed -- after the vessel passed over the first rocks or rock, it then hit a subsequent series of rocks and it came to rest with those rocks in this area here. This is some 300-plus feet from the bow, so, again, we're talking about a minimum distance the vessel would have had to have passed forward in order for the rocks to reach here.

Q You can tell, can you not, from the damage that was done on the starboard side, that the initial contact did not cause this vessel to stop immediately.

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, leading.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Rephrase your question.

Objection sustained.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q How can you tell that the vessel did not come to a

dead stop after it passed over the first rock?

A Well, if it passed over the -- back here, we just have light scoring. The first rock would not have been under the bow at that time because it would have raised the bow and, back here, we would have had much heavier scoring.

Q The first rock -- okay, it wouldn't have been under the stern.

A That's correct, the first rock would not have been under the stern here because we have light scoring. As the vessel moved forward, that rock, the first rock, could not have been under the stern, in my opinion, when it hit the second one because, had it done that and it would have lifted the bow, that would have made heavier marks back aft. In other words, it would have caused the stern, assuming this is the stern here — if the second rock came underneath the bow before the first one passed out from behind the stern, then the bow would have been lifted and the stern would have gone down and you'd have more scoring aft.

Q Well, how did this vessel go so far after hitting the second rock?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, no foundation, leading.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: The form of the question is -BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

2

7

B

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

passed astern of the vessel and then there would have been a time before it hit the second rock. However, if you look at the course recorder --

Q I don't want to go into that.

A Okay.

Q Just show what you mean by drawing a diagram. Can you do that?

(Witness approaches the drawing board.)

 THE WITNESS: Sure. Let's assume we have two high points or two rocks on the bottom here. This is the floor. The vessel is coming from left to right and the bow of the vessel passes over this first rock.

Q I think you're standing in the way of some of the

jurors. You need to --

A I'm sorry, let me move this side of it here. I can use my pointer. The bow of the vessel passes over the first rock. It has to proceed far enough so that this rock is behind the vessel. If it were not, we would find a crushing effect from this rock when the vessel was stopped. So we have passed 800 feet, minimum, to get from the bow of the vessel to the position where the score marks disappear on the bottom. That's 800 feet, approximately. So we now have a vessel which is somewhere in this position here.

Then this rock -- the vessel has to move forward far enough for this rock to come underneath the area in the center of the vessel where we have the crushing and that's another 300 and some feet.

Now you asked me about minimum and maximum. If this rock were just forward of the bow when this one was just after the stern, then that would be the minimum distance. We would have the length of the vessel -- and I'm not talking about the total length; I'm just talking about the portion that was scored -- 800 feet, plus the distance that it took the vessel to move forward onto that rock of 300-some feet.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Maybe you could show this by assuming that this is the first rock, right here, and this is the second rock. What would have happened as this vessel passed over?

A Okay, let me have the model.

MR. CHALOS: Judge, I thought the witness has already explained it. I think this is cumulative and this is the same question he just explained, the answer he just gave.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: We have the vessel hitting the first rock. Photographs indicate that it hit it just on the bow. It passes over it and it -- the score marks disappear somewhere in this area here. And so we have now passed with this rock astern -- I'm going to back the vessel up a little. I don't have enough room -- before it contacts this one and then it moves forward on this until it comes

3

Δ

5 6

7

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

to rest in this area here, which is where the crushing effect is found on the bottom.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Now if these rocks had been close enough for the Q vessel to come in contact with both, what would you have seen at the back of the vessel?

Well, if it had -- if this one had contacted before that one, if it had contacted the second rock before it passed over the first rock, I think you would find heavier score marks and more damage back here because this would tend to lift the bow of the vessel up.

- What would tend to lift the vessel? Q
- The rock, this rock, the second rock.
- Okay. Now can you give the jury an idea of how long this whole process would have taken, an estimate of how long this would have taken to do something like this?
  - Approximately two minutes. Α
  - And how did you reach that result? Q
  - Well, you can --Α
  - Based on speed and the distance traveled. Q

Well, it's a simple calculation. If you're going to assume that it moved forward a total of 1,100 feet, in other words, 800 plus 300, then you can figure out the time. It comes out to approximately two minutes. We know that the speed at the end was zero and we know the

 beginning speed, so we can use an average speed between the beginning speed and the ending speed.

Q Now let's go to something else and we'll come back to that. You were asked to reconstruct the course of the Exxon Valdez on March 23d and March 24th of 1989, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q What information did you use in doing that reconstruction of the track taken that evening?

testimony and such like that. But primary is the vessel's course recorder. This is an automated piece of equipment that records the heading of the vessel, minute by minute, as the vessel moves along. The second thing is a bell book. The bell book is kept on the bridge. It is manually kept and entries are made in it. They put things in it such as what speed — when they have a speed change, they put the new speed change in there. They may put positions in there, which in fact they did, in other words, that they passed the beam of a certain light or a certain aid to navigation, the timetables. The vessel kept a chart. We use the chart, the positions that were charted.

There is a bell logger on the vessel, also. A bell logger is an automated record of the orders to the engine room and the rpm that the vessel is going at any --

well, at whenever an entry is made. This is automated; it's not done by -- manually.

I also used the vessel's maneuvering characteristics characteristics. The vessel's maneuvering characteristics are posted on the bridge of the vessel. They're required by Coast Guard regulation and they show the speed at various rpm, under various load conditions. They also show the turning times for the vessel, in other words, if you put a rudder on, a full rudder on, how long it takes to turn and how far the vessel turns.

Q How about the drafts?

A Yes, the ship's log -- there were two places that the drafts were indicated. One was in the Coast Guard vessel data sheet and the other was the Calibret, which is an independent company that takes the soundings of the tanks on the vessel to determine how much oil was loaded. When they do that just before the vessel leaves, they take the draft of the vessel and they record it.

Q I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 2. Do you recognize that document?

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q And is that the course recorder of the Exxon Valdez?

A This is a copy of the course recorder for the

Exxon Valdez for the 23d, 24th, at local time, of March.

Q Now I'm showing you what's been identified as
Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 16, marked for identification as
Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 16. Do you recognize that
diagram?

A Yes, sir, I do, that's a section or a portion of the course recorder, Exhibit 2.

- Q And is that, in blown up form, an accurate reproduction of the Exhibit Number 2 that's previously been admitted?
  - A It is, with certain information added to that.
- Q We'll get to that. Is that of the whole -- is this --

A No, sir, it is not, it's a reproduction of a portion of Exhibit 3 -- I'm sorry, Exhibit 2.

Q Now there are certain names on this diagram. What do those represent, those names?

A The labels represent events that occurred so that in looking at this, you can correlate it with events that occurred.

Q And the labels that are on that, are they consistent with the opinions that you have drawn in this manner?

A Yes, sir, they are.

MR. COLE: Your Honor, I would move for admission

3

10

11

12 13

> 14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

what's previously been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 16.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I would have no objection, subject to this witness connecting the labels to his opinion later. Right now, we haven't heard his opinion, so without that opinion, I think it would be inadmissible. But I won't object, subject to the connection.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, it's admitted, subject to that condition.

> (State Exhibit 16 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Captain Greiner, would you take a minute and explain to the jury how you read a course recorder on a vessel?

(Witness draws on the drawing board.)

THE WITNESS: I'm going to draw a diagram first. It's a simple diagram of a compass rose. The compass rose and the compass is used to indicate in what direction the bow of the vessel is pointed and it runs from zero all the way around to 360 degrees, zero and 360 being the same point on it. There are four, obviously, quadrants to it. If you divide it into quarters, there are four quadrants. And for the purposes of the course recorder, we're going to examine only one quadrant at a time. The course recorder, itself, is an instrument which has a moving tape on it, this tape here, which is Exhibit 2. And it has two styluses or pens on it which leave a trace on it as the paper moves along. The styluses are connected to the lower one, which creates the large — which creates this trace here is connected to the gyro. In other words, the gyro points to the direction the ship is headed. And so at any one time, you can look at this and find the heading of the vessel.

However, this only represents a single quadrant. It doesn't represent the 360 degrees. In order to know what quadrant it is, we have the second pen or stylus which traces the quadrant up here. Now it's a little offset in this one, but this is the lower quadrant which is 270 to 360. So when the upper stylus is there, we're reading courses that are here and we will use the appropriate scale. Here is the scale right here, 270 to 360. When the stylus moves up into the next quadrant above — and I'm pointing to the upper stylus now — it shows 180 to 270. We will read the heading off of this, off of this scale here.

Now you'll notice that there are two changes here. In other words, the vessel is coming along in the lower quadrant. We're going to use this scale here. And

so at this point, it's at 270 or very close to it. This indicates that there is either -- because it's not at the bottom here, that there is either an error of one degree or that the recording mechanism has got some play in it there because we changed from one quadrant to another right at this point. So it should go all the way to the bottom and then start up again.

We now have moved into the second quadrant, the 180 quadrant to 270, so we've been going along here at 270 and then we swing into the other quadrant, we go 250, 260 as we come up this line.

Now that's how it works. I hope -- it's difficult for some people to explain. I hope I've explained it adequately for you.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Well, that's fine. Now you can take your seat.

(Witness returns to his seat.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Would you tell the jury how you read this as time? Is time measured on this?

A Yes, it is. The time is measured along this scale, right here, and it's measured -- because the vessel transits to various areas of the world or many and the time zone will change, the local time, it's common for them to use Greenwich (mean) time. Greenwich (mean) time is the

time kept at Greenwich, England, and it is a standard used throughout the world. And so these times are Greenwich time and you have to convert them over to local time, which is none hours different.

- Q So at 7:00 a.m. on that vessel, what time is it in Alaska time?
  - A It's 10:00 o'clock in the evening, 10:00 p.m.
  - Q Based on the course recorder --
- A Incidentally, there's an area here, it shows on the original, it says 2400 and that should be up here.
  - Q So 9:00 a.m. on this is 12:00 midnight.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q At 10:00 o'clock or in the time period prior to that, what course heading was the vessel going at during that time?
- A This was 270. It shows 269, I believe, but it's within one degree of that.
- Q And then which direction did the vessel turn at about 10:00 o'clock?
- A It turned to the left -- well -- yes, it turned to the left to transit the Narrows.
- Q And you indicated that it transited the Narrows there. How do you know that that was when it transited the Narrows?
  - A Because I know the time and in my reconstruction,

Now you indicated up there that the pilot was away

at 11:24, between 11:20 and 11:30? 1 Α Yes, sir. 2 And that was based on what? 3 This is based on the bell log, the one kept on the Δ bridge of the vessel. 5 And the next two notations up there, right at 6 11:30 and right at 11:40? 7 Yes, the turn starts at about 11:28, right in 8 here, and goes to --What is "cc 200 degrees"? 10 Change course to 200 degrees gyro. 11 And is that what's reflected by that particular 12 part of the graph? 13 Actually, it's 199, approximately. 14 And then what happens after that? 15 Well, they go along until about 40 and -- "minute 16 40," that's 40 minutes after 11:00 in the evening and then 17 they change course again to 180 and --18 Is that reflected by the "cc 180"? 19 Yes, sir, it is. This is the changing of the 20 course, right here, and then he's steady on about 180. 21 Now did you also use the bell logger in --22 Yes, sir. 23 -- in coming to your \_\_\_\_\_ here? I'm showing 24 you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's 25

 $\|$ 

labels in terms of --

MR. COLE: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: It's admitted with that condition.

(State Exhibit 17 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Now this diagram in Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 17 shows what, again?

A The automatic bell logger that's maintained on the vessel.

Q What does that show?

A It shows -- let me take an example here. There is a time and there is the engine order and there is the rpm at that time. Over here, we have a chevron indicating that that is an order and then these are the symbol for "at." I don't know what they're technically called, but those are made by the bell logger under its own program at a specific time. There may be an event that occurs that has nothing to do with rpm that is not reflected on here. This just reflects the rpm changes.

- Q Now --
- A Excuse me, may I add one more thing?
- Q There are times when you have a speed change where the rpm is given here, such as 50 rpm. The next one is two

minutes, well, not quite two minutes past that, it shows 55, so that it doesn't log each rpm change. You have to interpolate between those two entries to see that it went from 50 to 55.

- Q And the times that are on that, the times are recorded, is that correct?
  - A Yes, sir, it's the time that's recorded.
  - And are they on Greenwich (mean) time, also?
  - A Yes, sir, they are.
- Q So 9:00 o'clock would have been what time? (Tape changed to C-3641)

THE WITNESS: 9:00 o'clock would have been midnight, Alaska standard.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q And would you explain, just show the jury, beginning at the earliest point on that chart and when is the latest point on that chart?
- A Okay, the chart's read from the bottom, on the lefthand side, 7:00 o'clock, 7:47, Greenwich time, and 9:00, 9:00 Greenwich time, 9:00 Greenwich time, going up to 10:00, 12:00, 1600 -- this is in military time. When you get above 12, you have to subtract 12 from it to get the local. That's a p.m. That would be 4:00 p.m., 1600, and the date is there, the 24th of March.
  - Q And 9:00 o'clock Greenwich (mean) time is what

y

time in Alaska standard?

'A Midnight.

Q Now in reconstructing the track of the Exxon Valdez that evening, how did you do that? Explain to the jury how you did that.

A There are different pieces of information that you have to put together to make a track line. And in order to do that, I extracted them from the bell logger and from the course recorder and put them on a spread sheet, on a computer spread sheet.

Q What's a spread sheet? Just explain briefly what it is.

A A spread sheet is a way of listing information, line by line, and you can also have it do calculations for you. For instance, if I'm going to have an entry at minute one and an entry at minute two and, in the next column, I'm going to change — let's say I'm using the heading of the vessel and it goes from five to ten degrees, I can have it calculate the rate of turn in the next column if I wanted to. It has mathematical capabilities.

Q Now I'm showing you what's been marked for identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 155. Do you recognize that?

A Yes, sir, this is my spread sheet.

O Now what information did your spread sheet provide

you with?

A The first column, I used Greenwich (mean) time because the number of the records were in Greenwich (mean) time. The second column was converting it to local time, so that I could relate it to events that were in local time. The third was the heading of the vessel at the particular time that appeared in the first column.

Q How did you get that heading?

A That heading came off of the course recorder, which is this exhibit here. I took it off of this. And, actually, there is an expanded version of that which is even more accurate, but for all intents and purposes, it came from that source's information.

The next column is a calculated column where the spread sheet will calculate the rate of turn for you. In other words, it takes the difference in the heading and gives you the rate of turn.

Q During the period?

A During the interval between -- this is in every minute. In other words, it's logged every minute, so that the intervals are one minute apart. So it's the rate of turn in degrees in the preceding minute.

The next column is the bell log. The bell log is the manually kept log on the bridge that I mentioned. The next column is the bell recorder and the only thing that

that column has in it is when there was a change, such as here, they went full ahead. It just says "slow ahead," "full ahead," whatever it was. The following column is the rpm. The rpm is also taken from here and you'll see it right here. Now since I did mine minute by minute and this is not a minute by minute record, I had to interpolate between these entries.

The next column is speed of the vessel at a particular rpm. Now this is an uncorrected speed. This is the speed taken from the vessel's data which was corrected for its draft.

Q What do you mean, "corrected for its draft"?

A The vessel's data, the speeds for it on the maneuvering data are given under two loading conditions, fully loaded and ballast, which means empty. The vessel on this night was neither, it was in between, and it was about 78 percent loaded. And so you have to adjust because it is neither the speed that's shown for fully loaded or empty. So you take a percentage of that and that's what I've got here. I made a graph up of it. That's an uncorrected speed.

Then the next column is the speed correction column. The speed correction here is made for one of two reasons. Number one, when you increase speed, the vessel doesn't increase speed immediately. It takes a period of

time for it to increase. And so I have made an adjustment each time the speed increased or decreased. Also, when the vessel turns, if you go into a hard turn, when the turn is 90 degrees completed, you will have lost about a third of your speed, in other words, the vessel will have slowed down and so you have to make an adjustment when you make a turn. That gives you the speed through the water. And then I put in a current correction.

Q How did you get that?

A The current correction is based, in part, on the tide, on the rising tide, which you have here. You're going to have water flowing into Valdez Harbor and so you have to slow the vessel down to account for this current. The current is not great in Prince William Sound or even in the Narrows, but there is some. The correction is very minor there. That gives you speed over the bottom. It then calculates, the spread sheet calculates for me how far it's traveled in the last minute, how far the vessel's traveled in the last minute.

And the last column is accumulative distance traveled and I've taken certain points and set them as zero. In other words, when the vessel passed Buoy 9, for instance, I set that at zero and then let it run, so five minutes later, it would tell me how the vessel had traveled; six minutes later, it would tell me the same

thing.

The last column is a comment column and I put comments in there to remind myself of events that occurred which I've taken from logs or other information. Maybe it came from testimony.

Q So now the gyro headings that you took were off the course recorder that's here --

A Yes.

 $\mathbb{Q}$  -- and the expanded version of the course recorder.

A That's correct.

Q Then there's a formula for determining the rate of turn per minute, is that correct, and that's the next column?

A The speed correction column you're talking about?

Q No, after the heading, the gyro, the rate of turn per minute.

A Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, the rate of turn in degrees per minute is a calculated amount.

Q And the notations in the column from the bell log are from the actual bell log.

A Yes.

Q The bell recorder notations are the notations on the bell recorder that you observed in this case.

A Yes.

Q The rpm is based on the bell logger and your extrapolation in between.

A Yes.

Q The speed from the graph is determined by what again?

A The speed from the graph is determined by a mathematical calculation, based on the percentage loading of the vessel.

Q And the speed correction is based upon whether or not it's in a turn or not in a turn.

A That's a subjective correction, either for increasing or decreasing speed as a result of change of speed or decreasing speed as a result of a turn.

Q Now your comments, then, at 7:20, which would have been about 10:20, is that correct --

A I'm sorry, 7:20? Yes.

Q And you commented -- what was your comment there?

How did you reach that comment?

A "Entrance Island abeam on the port side, .36 nautical miles," that came out of the bell book that was kept on the bridge.

- Q Okay, and the comment that was made at 10:32?
- A Same explanation, same source.
- Q And the comment at 7:45, which would be 10:45.
- A Yes, 10:45 p.m., same source for that information.

2

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

Number 155.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: It's admitted. 2 (State Exhibit 155 was 3 received in evidence.) BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 5 Now based on the numbers that you received from 6 that document, did you prepare a diagram of the track line 7 taken by the Exxon Valdez? Yes, sir, I prepared an enlargement of a section 9 of the chart and placed a track line on it. 10 And where did you start from in your line? 11 The Narrows. 12 Okay. And where did you end up at on that? 13 Well, the track line ends up at Bligh Reef, where 14 it went aground. The chart goes a little south of that. 15 I'm showing you what's been identified as 16 Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 122. Do you recognize that 17 document? 18 Yes, sir, I do, it's the document I prepared that 19 we've been discussing. 20 And the red line that runs down through the middle 21 of this, what does that represent? 22 That represents the track line of the Exxon Valdez Α 23 on the evening of the 23d and the early morning of the 24th of March 1989. 25

MR. CHALOS: No objection.

information.

Q Now there is certain information that is provided and printed and put on adhesive next to that. How did you get that information?

on the labels came from, in some cases from testimony, in other cases from log book entries.

Q And is it accurate, to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes, sir, it's accurate, to the best of my knowledge.

Q Okay. And there's a red area on this. What is that?

A That's the red sector of Busby Light. Some aids to navigation --

Q Before we go into that, that's just the red sector, is that right?

A Yes.

MR. COLE: Your Honor, I move for the admission of what's been identified as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 122.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I have no objection, except as to one tab, specifically a tab at 2344. With that tab removed, I would have no objection to this document being admitted.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Why don't you bring it up here, so I can look at what you're talking about without showing

it to the jury? Okay, I see what you're talking about. Why don't you ask specifically this witness about that and if we can clear that up, we won't have a problem?

(The following was said at the bench.)

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I also object to this because that's not correct, what they say. It was the LPU, not sea speed, the input program. It would take another 45 minutes to get to sea speed is the testimony.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Why don't you see if you can clear that up with the witness.

MR. COLE: Sure.

(The following was said in open Court.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q The notation at 2344, you put that at what, why did you put that?

A I put that there because I got it from the testimony given by the helmsman.

Q Are you sure about that number?

A The number, itself, comes from -- the time comes from the fact that the -- what's indicated on here was given simultaneously with the order for the helm. It is not the point at which it occurs, but it doesn't purport to be the point at which it occurs, either. It's the point at which an order was given, not the point at which the action was taken.

MR. COLE: Could I have a minute, Your Honor? 1 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: What time is it? 2 MR. COLE: It's 9:52. 3 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: We'll take a little recess at this time. It'll be about ten or 15 minutes. Don't 5 discuss the case among yourselves or with any other 6 Don't form or express any opinions. person. 7 THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands at 8 recess. 9 (Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.) 10 (Whereupon, at 9:54 a.m., a recess is taken.) 11 (Defendant's Exhibit V-AB was 12 marked for identification.) 13 (Whereupon, the jury enters the courtroom.) 14 (The following was said at the bench.) 15 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You didn't tell me about this. 16 Now he's objected to this one and I think this is supported 17 by the evidence. 18 MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible) get a better fix on Naked 19 Island. 20 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: He said he was going into the 21 southbound -- the northbound lane, but he didn't say 22 anything about leaving the (inaudible). 23 : (Inaudible.) MR. 24 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Well, you have no objection to,

"The vessel was in a traffic separation scheme," you have no objection to that phrase, do you?

MR. CHALOS: No, none whatsoever.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: (Inaudible) but there was testimony that he called up and said, "We're going to deviate a little bit through the ice and I'll call you with a better fix at Naked Island"?

MR. : (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Before you do that, is there any testimony that supports he did it without advising \_\_\_\_\_?

MR. COLE: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: What is that?

MR. COLE: It's Cousins' testimony that

(inaudible) "Don't you think we should call because we're

leaving," and he said, "I already did that." And the

second thing was Taylor said he never called when they left

the zone and told that they had left the zone. He only

called about 11:35, right there, and said, (inaudible)

". . . through the ice."

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, I understand. Remember that when he was up there (inaudible) and you said Cousins testified that Captain Hazelwood told him to go ahead and take the course (inaudible).

MR. COLE: No, he said that, "When I was checking

the radars on the ice that I could see in the front, I told the captain (inaudible)," after the 2339 because he came on board there and that's the first thing he did, so it's sometime in here that he was plotting the ice and he saw it.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Who can testify it occurred right there? Who can testify that it occurred where that arrow is? Who has testified that it occurred where that arrow is?

MR. COLE: That the vessel leaves the traffic system?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Without advising them.

MR. COLE: He's going to testify that the vessel left the traffic system.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, is there any evidence that he advised ETC at that point that he was leaving the northbound lane?

MR. CHALOS: Judge, there's also no evidence that he had to tell them at that point. Further out, he's told them that, "I'm going to the southbound lane," and then called them up again (inaudible).

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I think I remember that testimony, he's got to deviate further.

MR. : I can show you the transcript.

MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, at this time, Mr. Cole,

when you're anywhere else here, it appears white. If you're in this area here, it appears red. And so if, as a mariner, you see it and it's red, you know that you're in this particular sector.

Q And that is just an outline of the dots that appear on the actual chart.

A Yes, sir, on the chart, itself, there is a dotted line that goes down there and there's a dotted line that goes down there that delineates this sector. The bottom line is not on the chart. I ended in there because that was past any interest that we have.

Q Now, you indicated that the triangles along this line are what?

A They're fixes. I use a triangle for fixes, that's the way I was trained.

Q And these begin from your -- when the vessel was abeam of Entrance Island?

A Yes, sir.

Q And then how did you get this area right here, what the course was through the Narrows?

A I principally used the fixes from the radar that the Coast Guard had to bring it through this area here.

Q And what was the heading after the vessel left the Narrows and started to enter the lower part of the arm?

A The heading is shown right here, course 219. The

indicate that a turn had been -- that a new heading of 200 degrees had been come to during right around 2339?

A Yes, at 2339, the course was changed to approximately 200.

Q That was the course it was running on. What was the speed of the vessel at about 2330, 2335?

A The speed over the bottom at 2335 was about 11-1/4 knots.

Q When did this vessel then leave the traffic separate scheme?

A Okay, the traffic separation scheme is outlined here by the dotted lines. There is an inbound lane and an outbound lane and the gray portion here is the separation between them. When the red line passed over the dotted line is the point at which he left the vessel traffic system or the scheme here and I calculated that at 2351.

Q And then the next notation that you have on that is 2352. What was that notation?

LPU, load program up. It's an automated sequence run by a computer that will increase the rpm of the engine and, thus, the speed of the vessel to its sea speed. Up to this point, it had been operating on full maneuvering speed, which is slower.

Q And the notation you have at 2353?

"Master leaves the bridge."

Now during this segment of the track of the Exxon

Α

1

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. COLE: I'm looking for the expanded course 1 recorder that I believe I had marked on Friday. 2 BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 3 Have you got the expander? 4 Q Yes, I do. 5 Α (State Exhibit 156 was marked 6 for identification.) BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 8 Now I'm showing you what's been marked for 9 identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 156. Do you 10 11 recognize that? Yes, I do. 12 Α What is that? Why do you recognize that? Q 13 Because, for one, I gave it to you, but it came 14 out of the National Transportation Safety Board hearing and 15 it's an expanded portion of the course recorder. Would you explain what it's an expanded portion 17 of? 18 Yes, this is an expanded portion of that that was 19 between 11:45 p.m. and 15, 16 minutes after midnight on the 20 24th of March 1989. 21 Can you give the jury an idea of what that would 22 be on this? 23 Yes, it starts somewhere in here and goes down to 24

approximately that point right there.

A Yes, the NTSB used an optical scanner to digitize

the course recorder and put it into a computer and then this was generated from the computer record that had been

Q And is it a fair and accurate representation of that segment in a blown-up sense?

A Yes, sir, it is.

MR. COLE: I would move for the admission of Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 156.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, may I have a short voir dire on this?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Approach the bench, please, Mr. Chalos, Mr. Cole.

(The following was said at the bench.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chalos, on several occasions, you have used short voir dire to cross examine witnesses and that's not the purpose of voir dire and you don't get a voir dire on every exhibit, unless you have a genuine good faith dispute with its foundation. Now what is your dispute? That sounds like, if anything, that's a foundation.

MR. CHALOS: Yes, this particular expanded version was done by the NTSB, but it's (inaudible). The NTSB is no longer relying on this because it was done in error, so

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor. He's leading

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24

25

the witness, no foundation.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, the -- I can indicate to you where the beginning and the end, where I believe the beginning and the end of the forward motion was on this course recorder. And I can indicate to you approximately where the end of the first contact occurred.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q Would you give your opinion on that?
- A Yes, sir. This area here, which I call a discontinuity is where the initial contact took place and it flattens out -- well, in this mode, it is sharper. And you can see it on the Exhibit 156 much better than you can see it here.
- Q Is that the initial contact or the place where it came to rest at 12:07?
  - A 12:07 was the place where it came to rest.
  - Q Okay, what were you pointing at there?
- A I'm pointing here at where -- at 12:05, almost 12:06 is where this line starts to change direction and obviously, it's come into contact with something which has slowed its rate of turn down and then the rate of turn starts to increase again. And if you look at the graph in this direction, looking right along the slope of the line, you can see that there is another change of the slope that occurs at about a minute seven and a half and this is where

I believe the vessel stopped.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

Q Would you explain why that curve does not indicate that the vessel started, was making a right turn and then started making a left turn at 270 degrees?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, form.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: The swing of the vessel is, with the exception of the changes that I've noted in here, is continuous all the way through this arc. The fact that the pen reverses does not mean that the vessel changed its swing because you'll notice up here that it changed sectors. And so the swing to the right continues through this. In other words, we're in the 180 to 270 sector here and so this swing is coming down this scale here. It reaches 270 there and then we have to look at the next scale because we've changed our sectors. And it continues to swing on to the right until it stops at this point here and reverses the swing.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q And how would that have occurred? Why did that occur? Why did it reverse its swing?

A The swing was reversed because I understand the rudder was shifted. When I say the rudder was shifted, I mean it was put from one side to the other side.

Q Now I'd like to focus on the time period from 12:38 on the course recorder to about 1:41. Would you

**\_** 25

describe for the jury the actions that are -- the heading changes that are occurring during this period?

A Okay, the headings are changing to the right and left every time you reach a peak because we're not changing sectors here, we're not changing quadrants. So the vessel's head is being moved back and forth. Each time we reach a peak on one end, that's the change from going from left to right or right to left and it changes back and forth all the way up to where the label "Stop" is.

- Q Was the vessel moving at this time?
- A In my opinion, it was not. When you say "moving," I'm sorry, what do you mean?
  - Q Was it going forward?
  - A No, sir, it was not going forward.
- Q What was the largest degree of turn in any one time?

A 14 degrees, 14-1/2 degrees and it's between here, this point at which the heading was 276 -- I'm using this scale here -- and up to here where it was 290-1/2 degrees. Let's call it 14 degrees.

Q Now based on this information and the damage diagram that has been made, that you observed and made available, can you give an opinion as to how far the bow might have been traveling during this 14-degree turn?

A Yes, sir. The bow moves back and forth, as does

the stern, when you pivot around a point. In other words, if the vessel is aground at a point and you're going to move it back and forth, the bow is going to move laterally and the stern. And using a 14-degree change in heading of a vessel, I came up with the bow -- if you're going to assume that the rock is, oh, somewhere around 384 foot from the bow, the bow will swing 94 degrees -- 94 feet back and forth.

- Q From one end of the turn to the other.
- A Yes, sir.

Q And how about the aft of the vessel, would it be moving during this time?

A Yes, sir, it moves the same number of degrees, but because the pivot point is forward of the center of the ship, it moves a greater distance laterally.

- Q Can you demonstrate that again with your little --
- A Yes, sir. If we're going to have the pivot point -- let's assume this is the bow. The pivot point is forward of the midships section here. As we move back and forth, we're going to have the same number of degrees turn -- and we're using 14 for this calculation -- but the amount that this goes back and forth is much less than the amount the stern goes back and forth.
- Q Do you have an opinion as to what Captain

  Hazelwood was attempting to do during that period, 12:38 to

1:41?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor. I don't think Mr. Greiner's been qualified as a master mariner or someone having a license as a deck officer, so I don't know if he can give an opinion as to what a captain is doing because he doesn't have that kind of experience.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: He's done accident reconstruction. He can give his opinion on the type of orders that are being given at this time.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled. He can give his opinion.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, the movement of the rudder back and forth is consistent with trying to work a vessel off of a rock or the bottom.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Why do you say that?

A I can think of no other reason for it. If the converse was true, that he was trying to hold it on there, he certainly would not have moved it back and forth. Also, moving it back and forth exposes the vessel to additional damage.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Move to strike, Your Honor, not responsive.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Cole?

decrease the buoyancy of the vessel and it could be totally 1 lost if it came off. MR. COLE: Nothing more, Your Honor. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chalos? MR. CHALOS: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 CROSS EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. CHALOS: 7 Good morning, Mr. Greiner. Q 8 Good morning, sir. I looked over your resumé here and I noticed that 10 you're an attorney. 11 I'm licensed as an attorney, yes, sir. 12 I see also that you're a member of the Washington 13 State Bar Association. Yes, sir. Α 15 The Maritime Law Association. Q 16 Yes, sir. Α 17 And the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. C 18 That's correct. 19 Have you, as an attorney, represented any clients? Q 20 Α Only once. 21 Just once in your career? Q 22 I represented a client outside the family once in Α 23 my career. 24 Did you do some personal injury work as a lawyer? 25

Α

2 The captain that we're talking about was your rank in the Coast Guard when you retired, is that right? 3 Α That's correct, sir. 5 , Q You don't hold a master's license for commercial vessels. 7 No, sir. Α As a matter of fact, you don't hold any licenses for commercial vessels, do you? No, sir. I was eligible for them, but I chose not 10 to sail. 11 You don't have, for instance, a chief mate's 12 license or a second mate's license or a third mate's 13 14 license --Α No, sir. 15 -- or a chief engineer's or second engineer's or 16 17 first engineer's? I have no licenses at all. 18 I see from your resumé, again, that the last time 19 you sailed was somewhere in the area of 1965 to 1967. 20 I sailed as a crew member, yes, sir. Α 21 And that was on the Coast Guard cutter, the Taney? 22 Q That's correct. Α 23 That's a 327-foot cutter. 24 Yes, sir. 25

1

Α

That's correct.

30 to 35 times in the past five years.

24

- A That's correct, sir.
- Q Do you consider yourself a professional witness?
- A No, sir. It depends on how you use the term, but I don't consider myself as such.
- Q Well, I take it your job is to consult and testify, right, that's your primary function?
- A My primary function is to consult. If it requires testimony and -- as you can by the number of cases I've consulted versus the number I've testified in, most of them do not require expert testimony.
- Q You don't have a job -- I mean, for instance, you're not a professional naval architect or a professional engineer or a professional salvage man who has a job that he does and then he testifies in those areas of expertise?
  - A I consider consulting in marine safety as a job.
  - Q But that is your only job.
- A Yes, sir. No, it isn't. The other portion of it is referring experts to other people, so there's two portions to the type of work I do.
- Q Okay. Now let's talk about what the State of Alaska has asked you to do in this case.
  - A Yes, sir.
    - Q What did they ask you to do?
- A They asked me to photograph the -- assist in the photographing of the bottom of the Exxon Valdez in dry

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That was in San Diego?

In San Diego, yes, sir. To evaluate the damage Α that occurred to the bottom of it. To reconstruct the track line of the vessel and to render opinion with regard to the actions that were taken after the vessel had gone aground.

- Okay. Were you asked to do anything else? Q
- No, sir. Α
- Nothing at all? Q
- Not that I can recall.
- Can you remember the State asking you to contact Q the Coast Guard to find out what the pilotage regulations for Prince William Sound were at the time of the grounding?
  - Yes, sir.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Yes, sir.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

I show you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit V and ask you, is that a letter you wrote to the Commander of the 17th Coast Guard District in Juneau on 29 May 1989?

- Yes, sir, it is.
- I show you what's been marked for identification Q

23 24

as Exhibit W and ask you, is that a letter you wrote to the

hearsay objection?

MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You're offering it for the truth of the matter that it was waived.

MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: That's hearsay and it goes to (inaudible). I think we'd better take this up outside the presence of the jury.

(The following was said in open Court.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: We need to take this matter up outside your presence. It may take a few minutes and I want to make sure we get a good record on it. Don't discuss the matter or speculate on what we're doing and don't form or express any opinions, please.

(Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, maybe we ought to just develop this on the record as completely as possible. As to Exhibits V and W, they're letters by the witness to the Coast Guard to obtain information regarding pilotage. The object was relevance. Why don't you now take it from there, what the purpose is?

MR. CHALOS: Yes, Your Honor, Mr. Cole has brought in several witnesses who have testified as to the issue of pilotage. And while I think that the issue is fairly muddied at this particular point in time, there has been

2 | t 3 | t 4 | f 5 | f 6 | w

1.2

testimony by some of the witnesses presented by Mr. Cole that pilotage was in existence in that area at the time of the grounding. He also hired Mr. Greiner, as part of his functions, to contact the Coast Guard to verify that, in fact, pilotage existed. Mr. Greiner has done that. He's written to the Coast Guard. He's gotten information from them and he's gotten public documents from them. He's been referred to public documents and, basically, they show what we've been saying all along, that the pilotage in that particular area has been waived.

I think that since Mr. Cole has brought up the issue initially and has presented testimony to the effect that pilotage existed, I think he has an obligation because that's inculpatory evidence now, he has an obligation under the Code of Ethics, if he has exculpatory evidence, which he does -- he's hired a man to get him that -- he has an obligation to bring it forth.

Now he didn't ask this witness any question about the pilotage and this witness said he wasn't asked to do anything else, but obviously that's not correct because he's written numerous letters and gotten several responses to them. So I think that I'm entitled to question him on it with respect to credibility, number one, and, number two, as exculpatory evidence.

Now the evidence that we're talking about is not

so much as to whether pilotage existed or not. What we're talking about is -- and Mr. Greiner, in one of his letters, pinpoints the issue -- is what could Captain Hazelwood reasonably believe at that time, given the situation with respect to pilotage. Could he reasonably believe that pilotage was waived, independent of whether in fact it was or not? And I think Mr. Greiner has come to certain conclusions and I would like to explore those conclusions.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right. Mr. Cole, at the side bar, said here's an objection, also, to the scope of the direct. This is something that's a totally new matter, it seems like to me, that wasn't covered in the direct, the pilotage. It has been covered by other witnesses. And you want to elicit his expert opinion as to whether or not Captain Hazelwood could reasonably have relied on information that the pilotage was no longer in effect.

MR. CHALOS: Yes, but, first, setting the foundation for it on the basis of information that he gathered in that regard.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Well, let's make sure we get this clear. You have other exhibits you haven't referred to.

MR. CHALOS: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You have information he received, Captain Greiner received, indicating that

pilotage had been waived and you want to admit those documents, also, at this time.

MR. CHALOS: Well, I can do it in one of two ways. I can ask him about it, without admitting the documents, Your Honor, or I can admit the documents if you think that would assist.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Well, I'm not telling you how to do your case. I'm asking you what your intentions are.

MR. CHALOS: I had intended originally to introduce the letters into evidence, but I can do it the other way. Right now, my intention is to introduce the letters.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, and also you wanted to ask Captain Greiner his opinion, as I understand it, his expert opinion, as to whether or not Captain Hazelwood could have reasonably relied on Coast Guard information that pilotage had been waived.

MR. CHALOS: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Well, I guess -- well, these are the two.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Cole indicated at side bench hearsay and outside the scope of direct. Those are the objections I've heard so far.

MR. COLE: Where are the two documents that he

3

5

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. CHALOS: What's that?

MR. COLE: Where are the two documents that he received from the Coast Guard that indicated --

MR. CHALOS: You mean the enclosures?

MR. COLE: Right.

MR. CHALOS: You never gave them to me.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: What is it you're trying to admit, Mr. Chalos, that's the question, what exhibits?

MR. CHALOS: I'm trying to admit Exhibits --

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: The two requests by Captain Greiner and how about the two responses? Are there responses you wish to have admitted?

MR. CHALOS: Yes, I'll identify the letters for the record, Your Honor. Exhibit V was the letter of May 29th to the Commander of the 13th Coast Guard District.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: That's V, as in Victor?

MR. CHALOS: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay.

MR. CHALOS: W is a letter dated May 29th to the Commandant..

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I have those down already. I'm talking about the responses that you want to admit.

MR. CHALOS: X is a letter from Mr. Greiner, again to the Commandant, dated July 20th, 1989. Exhibit Y is a

3

4

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

.18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

fax to Mr. Cole dated August 16th.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: A fax from Cole?

MR. CHALOS: No, from Mr. Greiner to Mr. Cole. And Exhibit Z is a letter dated October 18th, 1989, from the Coast Guard, from the Commandant's Office to Mr. Greiner.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: And is it in that letter where he has represented that the pilotage was waived?

MR. CHALOS: Yes. And Mr. Cole says that there's a reference to an enclosure in this particular letter and my response to that was we never received the enclosure.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, may I see the letter now, Exhibit A you're talking about? Why don't we take a brief recess and, Mr. Cole, you can look at that and you can articulate your objections when I get back, about five minutes?

THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands at recess.

(Whereupon, at 11:04 a.m., a recess was taken.) JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Be seated. All right, Mr. Cole? Judge, my objection is -- I'm going to MR. COLE: focus first on the answer from the Coast Guard to Captain Greiner. First of all, I've noticed that the enclosures that are noted in this, that are referred to are evidence that you have already excluded and that's Exhibit U.

MR. CHALOS: Wait a minute, no, no, that's not -that's --

MR. COLE: That's what it says, exhibit --Enclosure Number 2, Federal Register, Volume 53, Number 108 of June 6th, 1988. Defendant's Exhibit Number U is -which is proposed changes in the regulations to eliminate pilotage, these are proposed. Now you've already ruled that these are inadmissible because they were only proposed. And that's one of the --

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chalos didn't focus on that; he focused on the waiver of the policy.

MR. COLE: Right and that enclosure is based on a federal code of procedure, it looks like, the history of Prince William Sound. Our objections are, one, that is hearsay. The statement from Michael Brown is something that we cannot cross examine as to what he meant as a policy waiver was in effect. It's just plain hearsay.

Number two, the opinion that he's giving is speculative if it's in response to Captain Greiner's request of what a tanker captain would reasonably -- what Joseph Hazelwood would reasonably believe to be the law at this time, which is I think what he says in -- Captain Greiner says in his letter.

So for those two reasons, we believe that that information is speculative. It's also outside the scope of

6 7

5

1

3

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

redirect -- of direct.

As to the memo, Plaintiff's Exhibit Number Y, there's nothing on this memo that is relevant to the issues in this case, so Y we object to relevance.

As to Plaintiff's Exhibit Number W, X and V, which are all requests by Captain Greiner for information from the Coast Guard, first of all, two of them don't go to anybody that is referred to. I mean two of them go to Juneau — one of them goes to Juneau and there's no response and no nothing, so we would object on relevance grounds there.

As to the two letters that were sent on May 29th and June 20th, we feel that they have no relevance because of the hearsay objection to the response.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chalos, let me ask you a couple of questions and maybe we can speed this up. Without getting Z in, if you don't get Z in, what relevance does Y, X, W and V have? I mean the whole purpose of getting that in is to lay a foundation, isn't it, for the response of the Coast Guard waiving pilotage?

MR. CHALOS: Yes, Your Honor, as far as Z is concerned, I suppose I can ask him the question whether he received any information from the Coast Guard, without actually referring to the letter, because I don't think hearsay is an appropriate objection as far as an expert

basing his opinion on anything. The way I read 702 and 703, an expert may rely on what would normally be inadmissible in forming his opinion.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, now, we have a hearsay on one. We also have the opinion is speculative. I'm assuming that that means, in this case, how is Captain Greiner going to be able to speculate or give an opinion, expert opinion, on what Captain Hazelwood may or may not have been relying on, without further information than what he has so far.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, it's not the witness saying what Captain Hazelwood would have relied on, but anyone having access to this information, including himself, what would they conclude, what could a person reasonably conclude, not necessarily what Captain Hazelwood would have concluded. I'm not going to ask him his opinion of what Captain Hazelwood might have thought, but could a reasonable person, taking everything into account, including documents that he received from the Coast Guard, could a reasonable person conclude that pilotage had been waived, at best, and at worst, that it was a confusing situation.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Anything further you want to add to your offer to overcome hearsay and opinion objections?

MR. CHALOS: No, not at this time.

Objections on the basis of hearsay. Also, I will not permit the witness to give his opinion, as requested, because it would be based upon hearsay. It's also beyond the scope of his expertise. It's not the type of opinion that will assist the finder of fact in this case. It would disclose information that would be used by the jury for an improper purpose and the danger of that outweighs its value as support for the expert's opinion. It's furthermore outside the scope of direct testimony and has nothing to do with Mr. Cole's examination.

So for those three reasons, inquiry regarding what he asked the Coast Guard and any information he received from the Coast Guard or the use of that information in support of his opinion that a captain might be able to rely on a waiver of pilotage will be prohibited. Let's get the jury back in.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, before we bring back the jury, do I understand the Court to be instructing us that even if we call Mr. Greiner back as our expert on this particular issue, we'd be precluded from asking him questions about what he did in respect to opinion information with regard to the pilotage?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I just made a ruling based on the offer you've made now and Mr. Cole's objections. I

think you might be able to infer that if you ask the same questions of Captain Greiner if you call him as your witness that no longer would the objection beyond the scope of direct be applicable, but you might be able to infer that the other objections would still stand and I would rule the same way. I don't know what your questions would be, but if they were precisely what you've offered it for now with the same questions and the same rationale, I think you can reasonably rely that I would rule the same.

MR. CHALOS: And that's notwithstanding Rules 702 and 703 with respect to this kind of testimony?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: That's correct, I've ruled on the basis of, number one, hearsay and also, number two, 705 and 702. I don't think it's the kind of opinion that experts of his caliber would really rely on or people in Captain Hazelwood's position would rely on. And 705, the data that he relied on would be used for an improper purpose. So I've ruled on the basis of 702 and 705, and 703 incidentally, and 801. Are we ready now with the jury?

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, just one more point. Are you saying that the letters that he wrote to the Coast Guard are 801 hearsay documents?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I'm saying that based on what you've said, without his opinion coming in or without the letter from the Coast Guard, then they have no meaning, so

that would be a relevance objection which would be sustained. Let's bring the jury in.

(Whereupon, the jury enters the courtroom.)
(Tape changed to C-3642)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Thank you for your patience, ladies and gentlemen. You may resume, Mr. Chalos.

MR. CHALOS: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Q Mr. Greiner, just picking up where we left off, in addition to the things that you told us about, you were asked by the State to look into the issue of whether pilotage applied or not, were you not?

A Yes, sir.

Q So when you said that you weren't asked to do anything else, that was a mistake.

A I was giving you the principal things they had asked me to do and that was such a small part of what I had done that I didn't consider it of significance. I had forgotten it, as a matter of fact.

Q Even though you wrote to the Coast Guard three, four or five times and you also filed an appeal, correct?

MR. COLE: I object.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, this goes to credibility.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I think he's answered the question and I think to go any further would go against the

A I don't know what exhibits have gone into evidence, but I reviewed a number of -- I've reviewed all the NTSB exhibits, yes.

Q All of them?

A No. All of those that were listed. In other words, they provided a list of them and in some of them, they said "Not available," so those obviously I didn't review.

- Q And I take it you reviewed statements given to the NTSB by various crew members.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q All right, let's go to San Diego. One of your tasks was to hire a photographer, was that --
- A I recommended the photographer, they hired him, yes, sir.
  - Q Are you taking a piece of his fee?
  - A No, sir.
- Q Now what was the purpose of your going down to San Diego?
- A The purpose of it was to look at the damage, to assist the photographer. I took the notations as to where the photographs were taken and looked at the damage.
- Q Okay. And after doing that, you told us you came to certain conclusions, is that right?
  - A At some point or other, yes.

Q The first conclusion that you came to was the vessel was sitting on some rock in the way of Tanks Number 2 and 3?

A Actually, that was the second conclusion. The first conclusion was that it passed over a rock.

Q And then came to rest on a different rock in the way of Tanks Numbers 2 and 3?

A That's correct.

Q And you also came to the conclusion that there was a lot of set in damage, that is damage pushed up, in that area as a result of the rise and fall of the tide?

A Yes, sir, in the way of 2 and 3 tanks.

O Do you remember -- this vessel ran aground on the 24th of March.

A Yes.

Q Do you remember what day it was refloated?

A Not precisely. It was April 8th, 6th, something like that, in the neighborhood, I believe.

Q So she was aground, you would agree, ten, 12, 14 days?

A Yes.

Q And you had two tides a day.

A Yes.

Q The vessel moved up and -- rather the vessel shifted at each time.

22

23

24

25

A I would expect it to.

Q Did you come to any conclusions as to whether the vessel stayed on the bottom, wherever it was resting on the bottom, throughout the tide changes?

A Yes.

Q In other words, the only thing that moved during the tide changes was the vessel heeling one way or the other, depending on the state of the tide.

A That is correct.

Q But she was resting on the bottom at all times.

A Yes.

Q Now you saw certain damage at San Diego, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q You don't know, do you, whether that damage that you saw in San Diego was caused by the grounding, subsequent to the grounding and moving the vessel off the ground and taking the vessel to Naked Island or taking it back down to San Diego?

A Some of it was obviously damage that occurred afterwards, yes.

Q But you can't tell exactly what damage occurred where.

A That's not true.

Q Well, tell us about the damage that you could tell

that occurred at the time of the grounding.

A The crushing damage occurred at the time of the grounding. The vessel was afloat after she came off ground. The first series of damage that I described to you occurred while the vessel was in a turn. It was five degrees, approximately, from the keel. And it's my opinion that they occurred when it passed over the first rock and came to rest on the second rock.

Q Well, we're going to get to that opinion because I think it needs to be explored, but what I'm saying is the actual damage that you viewed in San Diego was not the condition of the vessel when she ran aground, was it?

A Well, it wasn't the condition of the vessel when it ran aground. The damage --

Q At the moment of grounding.

A But with respect to the plates, no. With respect to the structural members, it occurred as a result of the grounding and it may have been aggravated while she was aground at dates later than the date she went aground.

- Q Because of the tidal condition.
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Now we saw some pictures here where the plates were missing.
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q You can't tell -- could you tell when you looked

.

. 22

at the vessel in San Diego what was carried away as a result of the grounding and what was cut away in preparing the vessel to go to San Diego?

A No, sir.

Q Now did you come to any opinions as to whether the vessel was impaled on the rock when she was aground?

A I've described how it sat on the rock. When you say impaled, I'm not sure exactly what you mean.

Q What I mean by that, was the rock sticking up into the ship at some point?

A Well, it certainly was one, we have a photograph of it. As I looked at the damage, at some points -- how far in the ship are you talking about? In other words, obviously, the rocks protruded in below where the original skin was.

- Q That's what I'm driving at. There was evidence of that.
  - A Oh, certainly, certainly.
- Q Have you heard of the term "interference with the bottom"?
  - A I don't know how you're using it.
- Q Well, the way I'm using it is, for instance, a rock protruding up or steel protruding down across the bottom. Have you heard of those terms?
  - A Yes.

O And you had evidence of that in this case, did you not?

A Yes.

Q Now let's talk about your opinion about the two significant touchings. You say that, you opine that there were two touchings starting at five minutes after midnight and continuing to about seven minutes after midnight?

A Yes, sir.

Q It took two minutes to go through the initial hit and then the ultimate stop.

A Yes, sir, approximately.

Q And how long did you say the vessel -- how long did it take for the first rock to travel the length of the vessel?

A Approximately a minute.

Q In your opinion, what kind of noise would the crew expect to hear? What kind of vibration would they expect to feel?

A It depends on where you are in the vessel and I talked to a number of people who have been on vessels that have gone aground and they hear different noises in different places on the ship. It's strange. Sometimes they're almost totally inconsistent.

Q Well, I thought you testified that, in your opinion, the first hit was a substantial hit in the sense

that it made this tunnel right down the center of the ship, veering off to starboard, is that right?

A Yes.

- Q Now that kind of tunneling, you would expect the vessel to be hitting pretty hard, wouldn't you?
  - A Relative -- yes.
- Q And you would expect, if you're a crew member, to hear something or feel something.
  - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Now you read the testimony, you said, of certain crew members. Do you remember reading that they felt a tilt and some vibrations for a period of 15 to 20 seconds and then the vessel stopped?
- A I don't remember -- I remember them hearing the noises periodically. I don't remember the latter part of your question, that it then stopped. I don't know what you mean by then. Obviously, it stopped within --
- Q The vessel then came to a dead stop after 15 or 20 seconds. Do you remember reading that testimony?
  - A No, no, I don't.
- Q If that was the testimony, that contradicts what you said, doesn't it?
- A Not necessarily. Vessels go aground sometimes without people hearing them go aground, so some of the initial damage may have not been of such a noise level that

they heard it.

Q And that's just speculation on your part, isn't it?

A That's correct. I'm drawing on my experience where vessels have gone aground and some people haven't heard anything.

Q All right, let's talk about -MR. CHALOS: May I approach the witness, Your
Honor?

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Q You say that you believe, referring now to Exhibit 16 -- incidentally, when you reviewed the statements given by the crew members to the NTSB, is that the kind of thing that you would do normally in the kind of reconstruction that you were hired to do here?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you rely on what they said and come to certain conclusions?

A I may or may not rely on what they say, I would take it into consideration, because obviously there's contradictory testimony and you try and figure out which one fits the pattern best.

Q Okay. Now you believe that the grounding occurred somewhere between 12:05, the initial hit --

A Yes, sir.

Q What did you conclude the rate of change was, per minute, after 12:07?

A The spread sheet indicates that it then went up to 27 degrees at minute eight and 17 degrees at minute nine and then it tapered off and then it reversed.

Q Okay. Just so we don't confuse the jury, the course came down to about -- I guess, 12:09, it came to 270 and then continued on until about 305, about ten after.

A Yes, sir.

Q It's fair to say, isn't it, that, so the jury is not confused, if you took this section and just dropped it, that would be more representative of what was happening.

A Yes, you could flop this over and lay it down below and for this purpose, it would probably be less confusing.

Q Right. In other words, the ship came to 12:05, to 12:07 there was a slight hitch in there and then she continued to swing on a steady basis right up to course 305 to the right.

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. And then there was a hard left at that point.

A That's correct.

Q And that's the 12:10. Now do you remember reading Mr. Cousins' testimony, that he said he ran aground and he

: : immediately went over to the wheel and gave it a hard left?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Now that happened at 12:10, didn't it, according to the course recorder?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q At what time did that happen?
- A Well, it occurred before that. The response of the ship is not instantaneous. In other words, first of all, it takes time to swing the rudder over. Secondly, it takes time for the rudder to follow. And then you have a reaction time. So --
  - Q Well, it wouldn't take four minutes, would it?
  - A No, sir.
- Q It would take about 30 seconds for all this to happen?
- A Well, the swing of the rudder, it depends on where you start it from, but my recollection was that it takes 25 seconds to swing from center to full and that's just for the rudder to follow the command, so that's at least 25 seconds. Plus it takes you time to turn it over yourself.
- Q Were you here or did you read the testimony of the Sperry people that said they did a test on this ship and they could go from hard right to hard left in about 26, 27 seconds?
  - A I received information both that it took 25

seconds to go from hard left to hard right and from zero to hard left and I thought it was a Sperry that said from zero to hard left was 25 seconds. I may be incorrect on it, but I did not read their testimony on it.

Assuming it took even a minute, and I'll give you the benefit of that, if Mr. Cousins said, "We ran aground. I ran over to the wheel and gave it a hard left," and let's say that that whole process took a minute.

A Yes.

Q If this is shown that the hard left -- or rather the left swing of the vessel started at about 11 after, right -- it's fair to say, then, that what Mr. Cousins was describing took place around ten after, isn't it?

A Yes.

Q Okay, that doesn't square with what you're saying was the time of the grounding, does it?

A You're leaving out other parts of the testimony, though.

O Such as?

A I think there was the testimony that the vessel veered sharply to the right. 'And if you look at the portion of the course recorder from here to there, or at least up into here, there is an increase in the rate of turn from here down and up through there. But that fits

with his testimony, so --

Q Well, do you recall Mr. Cousins saying that before the grounding, he gave this vessel a hard right? Do you remember that?

A I have not read Mr. Cousins' testimony before this Court.

Q Well, is the rate of turn of I think you said 27 degrees, then dropping down to about 20 degrees per minute, isn't that consistent with how this vessel would react with a hard right on it?

A I'm not sure that it would be a hard right, with a right rudder on it. I -- you know.

Q All right. And isn't it also consistent, then, with Mr. Cousins saying, "I put hard right on there and the vessel swung to the right and then we ran aground and I ran over and gave it a hard left"?

A Yes, but you've left out the testimony that went between that and that is the vessel veered sharply to the right.

- Q After the grounding?
- A After the grounding, yes, sir.
- Q Okay. Well, wouldn't that be picked up in this area here somewhere after 12:10?

A No, sir. No, sir. What you're proposing is that this area right here be the hard right rudder where, in

representation of this -
A Yes.

23

24

25

Q -- that's not correct because this is a minute

off, isn't it?

A Well, how much do you want to nit-pick on it? It is a representation of the line and the shape and such like that of this, yes.

- Q A minute off?
  - A Approximately, yes.
- Q Now you started to tell us how the NTSB got this expanded version. You said it was done by some sort of -- what?
  - A Optical scanning.
- Q That optical scanning gives you a point to point reading, doesn't it?

A It gives you -- it digitizes the line. When you say point to point, it digitizes it in increments of points. I mean --

So it's not really a reproduction of this. It's an interpretation of this, isn't it?

A Well, when you -- I don't know what you mean by interpretation. We print things out on printers nowadays that are made up of dots, but you don't see dots, you see the character, itself. You can make it -- when you go into a newspaper, you print things at 600 dots per inch or less and it comes out -- you can reproduce this as dots. This line is not as thick as that line, there's no question about it, and that's why this line is easier to use. But

4

5 6

7

. 8

10 11

12

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

you can do that by adjusting it in the computer.

Now you haven't done any reproduction or any expansion of this yourself, have you, of this course recorder?

- A Yes, I have.
- Do you have that here with you?
- No, but it's just like this. Α
- All right, let's talk about something else for a second. You say you believe because of this hitch at 12:05, 12:06, that represents the first hit, is that right?
  - Α Yes.
- Did you, on your plot, your course recording plot, figure out where the ship was at 12:05? Did you run it down?
- Yes. At -- no, not at 12:05, I didn't. The latest time I have on here is two minutes after 12:00.
- Well, if the vessel happened to be, at 12:05, in an area where there's 38 fathoms of water, your theory would not be supported, would it?
- I would doubt that that could occur because the only other thing that have caused this is bottom action and I don't think you're going to get bottom action from this type of bottom with that characteristic and the rapid buildup and such like that.
  - Now is that the only thing that could cause this

little hitch in the course recorder at 12:05, just 1 bottom --Α No, sir. How about some counter rudder? That's correct, that could. 5 Do you remember reading the NTSB statement of Mr. 6 O 7 Kagan? Α Yes. 8 And do you remember Mr. Kagan telling the NTSB that he was trying to steady up on course 245 and he used 10 11 some counter rudder? Yes, the statement is not a verbatim statement. 12 It's a summary by somebody who is interpreting what he says 13 and it contains words similar to that. I don't have them memorized. 15 What course was this vessel on at the time you say 16 17 it ran aground? When it first ran aground? 18 Α In this. 19 Q · 20 Α Right here. Right here. What course is she on? 21 Q Let me get it from my spread sheet here. About 22 Α 23 234. Now take a look at the course recorder. 24 Q 25 Okay, we're coming down here. We're in this

1

Yes. Q

3 4

-- and so we're using scale here -- I'm sorry,

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

thank you -- 248.

And the line starts actually a little bit before Ö there, around 244, does it not? In other words, what I'm saying is before you get to the flattening out of the course, you'd have to move the rudder prior to when it indicates on there.

If you're going to assume that that's made by a rudder, yes.

Q Okay.

In other words, it isn't a sharp zig-zag. It's faired. There's a gradual change, yes.

Okay. Now isn't that change consistent with what Q Mr. Kagan told the NTSB, that is that he was trying to steady up at 245 at that point?

No, it isn't. Α

It isn't. Q

Α No.

So you're saying that there's no doubt in your mind that at that point in time, the vessel was aground, but you don't know on your chart where the vessel was located?

Where it was located -- I put the grounding

.

4

7

8

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

location on the chart. I'm not sure I understand your question.

Q Well, I think what you're saying is you work backwards. What you're saying is that you know the vessel ran aground here --

A Yes.

Q -- and you assume that that's 12:05, 12:06.

A 12:07.

Q Okay, what I'm saying to you is did you run it down this way on the basis of your calculations to find out where that ship would have been at 12:05?

A 12:05 is somewhere in this area right here. Let's see, three -- wait a minute. Yes, it would be somewhere in that area right there.

Q Okay and there's 38 fathoms of water in that area, isn't there?

A Well, we go from, and very sharply, we go from over 20 down to ten.

Q Okay, but ten, ten fathoms, plus two for the tide is 12 fathoms, right? That's 72 feet. And this ship was drawing 57 feet.

A Yes.

Q So it wouldn't have hit there, is that right?

A Have you -- I'm sure you've worked with charts before and soundings and --

Q The question is either yes or no. If the ship is drawing 57 feet and there's 72 foot of water, she's not going to --

- A It would -- okay, that's correct, that's correct.
- Q Now let's talk a little bit about this spread sheet that you used, that you made up.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q That particular spread sheet is a computer generated spread sheet?
  - A Parts are computer, parts are manually entered.
- Q You had prepared a spread sheet originally which had certain numbers, is that right?
- A I prepared a number of spread sheet. As I've gotten information, I changed them and such like that, and you'll notice the date at the top of it which indicates it's just like drafts of a letter.
- Q Okay. You've made some recent changes to your spread sheet, didn't you?
  - A As late as this morning, yes, sir.
- Q Okay, and you made some changes on the basis of a simulation that you received from the NTSB, is that correct?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q You didn't make any changes on the basis of --
  - A You said that I received from the NTSB. I didn't

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Okay, who did you receive this simulation --

I received it from Kings Point, the people that made it up. Well, actually, I received it from the attorney general -- the district attorney's office, I had received parts of it. And I just learned about it and inquired about it and he said yes, he had it, and he gave it to me. I just had it a few days.

Okay, this -- the report that you reviewed is a Q computer simulation of the vessel's course, is it not?

Α Yes.

And it was prepared by the Marine Safety International KAORF people at Kings Point.

Α Yes.

Have you read this? 0

I've gone through it, yes. I have not made a Α specific analysis of it. I've made some comments on it, yes.

And you used some of the data from this, as well, in your calculations, did you not?

Yes, I did. Α

And this is the type of report that experts like yourself would look at in making a reconstruction of courses?

Certainly, we look at them, yes.

Q Have you ever used simulator facilities before, such as KAORF?

- A No, sir, I have not.
- Q Now when you made this chart with your track line, that was before you saw this report, right?
- A Before I saw anybody else's reconstruction, yes, sir.
- Q Okay. But since then, after you looked at this report, you've made changes in your own calculations, right?
  - A Yes.
- Q So if you were to replot this, it would be different. I'm not saying it would be a lot different or a little different, but it would be different than this, on the basis of your new numbers.
- A The only thing that was changed was the rate of turn here or, actually, when the turn started, that's the only thing that was done with respect to that.
- Q Now in your calculations, which is -- what did we say it was? Is it 156? No, 155.
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q What rudder angle did you assume?
- A Initially, I assumed -- where are you talking about?
  - A Along the track line. Let's start with -- let me

withdraw the question. I'll set the foundation. 1 Do you agree that at 2355, the vessel was abeam of 2 3 Busby Island Light? Yes, sir. Okay, let's start there. 5 Okay. 6 Α Coming down to about a minute and a half after, I 7 Q take it you assume that the rudder was in the middle, 8 9 amidships. Principally, yes. 10 Starting at a minute and a half, two minutes 11 after, what rudder angle did you assume in your 12 calculations? 13 I didn't assume any -- I did not use a rudder 14 angle to come up with my calculations. 15 You didn't. 16 17 No. Well, wouldn't the placement of the rudder, the 18 rudder angle, affect the speed of this vessel? 19 Certainly. 20 Α So in other words, the more rudder you have, the 21 slower the ship is going to go. Correct. 23

That's called the braking effect, right?

Q

Yes.

24

Q Okay. Well, how did you determine your speed if you didn't figure any rudder angle?

A I assumed for turns that there would be a slowdown and it -- there are no statistics given in the vessel's characteristics or data for anything, except a hard rudder. And so if you're going to use less than a hard rudder, it would be significantly less. And if you'll notice the amounts that I used, the speed corrections, were generally under a knot. They were not -- I didn't use much speed correction at all.

Q Well, you had a chance to look at the KAORF simulation, did you not?

A Yes.

Q And they did a whole analysis of what the rudder angle was at any particular time, right?

A Yes.

Q And you didn't use any of those numbers?

A I used -- I changed my mind with -- I was convinced that a hard rudder had not been put on from that report. I found a number of things that I didn't agree with in the report. But I did use that portion of it, yes.

Q Did you also conclude that less than ten degrees of rudder was used at any particular time from 2355 until the grounding occurred?

A Yes.

Q You did.

Yes.

Q What degree of rudder did you conclude was used?

A I didn't come up with a specific amount. It was less than ten, more than four, somewhere around seven or eight degrees. We're talking about average rudder; we're not talking about the actual rudder. We're talking about over a period of time, what the average rudder was.

- Q Now are you familiar with -- strike that. Did you look at any charts that gave you precise soundings in the area of Bligh Reef?
  - A No charts, no, sir.
- Q Wouldn't that have assisted you to support your conclusion by looking at a detailed sounding chart and running your track line to it?

A If you'll pardon me, you're nit-picking. I didn't calculate this with the intent of identifying every rock on the bottom or whether the vessel was five feet to the left or five feet to the right. The purpose of this is to give the jury an idea of what occurred.

Q Well, you'll have to forgive me. I'm not nit-picking in the sense that you came to a certain conclusion that contradicts what the evidence is in this case. I want to test the theories and the basis for your conclusions.

Α Okay. 1 2 So I want to know if you looked at a detailed sounding chart of Bligh Reef to make a determination as to 3 whether your theory that the vessel was aground at five 4 minutes after midnight is correct. 5 No, I didn't. 6 You know that they're available, do you not? 7 I know they're available a lot of places. I was 8 not aware that there was one available here. Are you familiar with the U.S. Department of 10 Commerce Hydrographic Survey H-9384? 11 No, I've never seen it before. 12 Α You've never seen it before. 13 No. 14 You didn't even know it existed, did you? 15 That's correct. 16 These are soundings of Bligh Reef, are they not? 17 What's what it purports to be. What's the date on 18 it? 19 1973. Q 20 Okay. 21 In any event, you made no attempt to look at any 22 chart with detailed soundings? 23

Sir, you made certain calculations with respect to

That's correct.

24

your theory that the vessel hit twice, is that correct? 2 Yes, sir. You're talking about the speed and 3 time. Q Yes, the speed and time. Α Yes. Distance. Let me show you. Oh, you have it in front of you. Yes. I don't have the same copy you do because 8 Α when you were talking to me the other day, I noticed an error in it and I corrected it. 11 Okay. When did you make these calculations? Q 12 Initially? 13 Q Yes. 14 Last week. 15 Was that the first time you made these calculations? 16 17 А Yes. 18 Was that the first time you came up with this theory of two hits? 19 20 Α No. sir. 21 Did you speak to Mr. Voras about this theory of the vessel hitting twice? I'm sure it came up in casual discussion, but I 23 never went to him and said, "What do you think?" But I'm 24

sure it's come up in casual discussion.

ì

- Q Did you see Mr. Voras' letter of September 11th, 1989, which we marked as Exhibit AA for identification?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q You've never seen this?
  - A Not to the best of my recollection, no, sir.
  - Q Okay. I'm going to read you a paragraph.

MR. COLE: Objection, hearsay.

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, I just want to see if this is part -- if he relied on any of this in form or substance to form his opinion.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: He said he's never seen it. He said he's never seen the letter, Mr. Chalos, so how would you expect him to answer he relied on it?

MR. CHALOS: The contents, not the letter.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection sustained, Mr. Chalos.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Mr. Greiner, did you and Mr. Voras have a discussion that it would be important for the district attorney, for you, as experts for the district attorney, to conclusively establish that there were two hits as a basis for saying that the logical conclusion of that would be that Captain Hazelwood would not try and back this vessel up?

A No, sir, I don't remember any discussion between Mr. Voras and I on that subject.

Q Did you have any discussion with any of the other experts on this notion that you had to prove that the vessel hit twice?

A No, sir, there was never any discussion that we had to prove anything. We were given our -- we were told to come up with our own conclusions.

Q And you say you didn't discuss that conclusion with Mr. Voras before you came up with it.

A No, sir. I think the answer is yes, sir, that is correct, I did not discuss it with him.

G Like a good lawyer, right. Okay, let's talk -MR. CHALOS: May I approach the witness again?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You don't need to keep inquiring
for that. You've got free leave.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Q Let me ask you to come to the chart table for a second. Would you draw on here how you believe this vessel was aground? Do you have a notion of how the vessel was aground?

A You're talking about when it was -- when it finally stopped?

Q Yes, when it finally came to a rest.

(The witness draws on the board.)

THE WITNESS: Basically, that was the principal part of contact.

All right, could you give us a side view below? (The witness draws on the board.) BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) Okay, and what part was resting on the bottom? 5 You're talking about port or starboard? 6 The starboard side. Q 7 (The witness draws on the board.) 8 THE WITNESS: It also probably depends on the tide, but --10 BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) 11 Well, I think you told us that the vessel remained 12 on the bottom at all times anyway. 13 A I'm talking about the extent. In other words, if 14 the vessel sits down on this and this is put into it --15 Q · Right. 16 -- it might be over a larger --17 Well, let's say as it's approaching high tide. 18 that what you're drawing there? 19 (The witness draws on the board.) 20 BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) 21 Q Okay, this area right here at the stern, okay --22 This? Α 23 Yes, mark that with an A, if you will, as being 24 the engine room area, wherever you would see the engine 25

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

2 (The witness marks on the board.) BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) And where's the propeller and the rudder? Q (The witness draws on the board.) 5 THE WITNESS: No, you're correct, it is not. 6 BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) 7 8 Q All right, can you -- even though your scale is off there, can you tell us approximately how many feet the vessel would have to travel forward before the propeller 10 11 and engine room were reached on that rock? Approximately 400 to 450. 12 Q Would you write that down, 450 feet? 13 (The witness marks on the board.) 14 BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) 15 So before the vessel's engine room would be in 16 danger of holding or the propeller or the rudder be in 17 danger of striking that rock, that it was aground, the 18 vessel would have to travel 450 feet? 19 20 Α Yes. In your calculations, did you do any 21 calculations as to how many tons this vessel was aground? 22 23 Α No, sir, I didn't. Would you explain to the jury what we mean by tons 24 aground? 25

1

room, right.

The amount of weight that is supported by the

Α

A No.

Q You don't.

A There's no way to calculate it. We don't know the amount of -- the total amount of contact area, the intrusion and how much it will take. However, we're looking at it with hindsight and the captain didn't have that knowledge at the time.

- Q That's not my question. My question is there are formulas for determining how much thrust would be needed to move this vessel one inch, are there not?
  - A With no rock?
  - O With the rock, the way it was aground.
  - A You'd have to make certain assumptions, yes.
  - Q Okay, you didn't make that calculation.
  - A No, sir, I didn't.
- Q So when you say that he risked damaging the engine room or the propeller, you really have no basis for saying that. In other words, you don't know if Captain Hazelwood's vessel was capable of moving even one inch forward in the manner that she was aground.
- A Obviously, it wasn't. It didn't move forward, apparently.
- Q Is it your opinion that this vessel, in spite of the use of the engine and the rudder, it did not move forward?

known to be soft mud.

Q And you weren't navigating at the time. I take it it was somebody else.

A No, sir, I was on the bridge, but I wasn't navigating.

- Q Okay, the vessel ran into the bank of soft mud?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q How did she come back?

A She continued to swing on hard rudder and there was a tug that when she had backed around, pulled her free of the bank. I'm sure the ship's --

- Q In other words, they pulled her backwards.
- A Yes.
- Q Sir, would you agree that when this vessel ran aground, she was hard aground, given the evidence?

A After it stopped, yes, sir. With good hindsight, yes, sir.

- agree that -- strike that. I'd like to talk a little bit about this red sector that you drew. This is -- what you're talking about here with the red sector is what you would expect someone that's on the bridge of the ship, looking back at Busby Island Light would see in that particular area.
  - A If the vessel was within it, yes, they would.
  - Q Okay, so if the vessel is anywhere beyond this

Q If a ten-degree right rudder was placed on this vessel, given the condition she was in and the speed she was traveling, do you have an opinion as to whether she would have missed Bligh Reef?

- A Yes.
- Q What's your opinion?
- A It probably would have missed Bligh Reef.
- Q Again, you haven't done the calculations.
- A That's correct.
- Q Okay. If the turn was started at a minute and a half after, using your figures, and a ten-degrees right rudder was placed on the vessel, in the condition she was in, at the speed she was traveling, do you have an opinion as to whether she would have missed Bligh Reef?
  - A She may have passed over the 20 fathom mark there.
  - Q That's 120 feet.
- A I know that. And that's also when you should be concerned in that area. It goes up very rapidly.
- Q All right. Aside from being concerned, she still would have made it, in your opinion.
  - A At a minute and a half after midnight, yes.
- Q Sir, there's been some talk by some witnesses that after the grounding, the captain used full maneuvering speed, do you recall that, in --
  - A Yes, sir.

10

11

13

14 15

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Do you know how much horsepower this engine can generate at 55 horsepower -- at 55 revolutions?

No, sir, I don't.

Do you know how much horsepower this engine can generate at full sea speed?

No, sir, I don't. Α

I take it you didn't try to acquaint yourself with those characteristics of the vessel.

No, sir. You asked me that before and I said I did not do anything with regard to horsepower.

Sir, if the captain's intent, as you testified, was to go forward and try and get off the reef, would you expect him to use 55 rpms or the full sea speed, if he was hard aground as you've described?

I'm not familiar enough with the plant to know if the plant can go directly up to full sea speed without going through the computer load up system. I think you may be able to bypass it and do that, but I don't have that specific knowledge. From the bridge control, the best knowledge I have is that you can go to full maneuvering speed directly.

I want you to assume for a moment that the engine has a feature that permits the captain, in an emergency, to use full sea speed just by pressing a button. If in fact he's trying to drive this vessel forward off the reef,

1 would you have expected him to go to full sea speed ahead? 2 I can't anticipate what this captain would have 3 done under those circumstances. 4 MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, if we can have a short 5 break, I think I can wrap up fairly quickly. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right. 7 MR. CHALOS: I just need to gather my notes 8 together. 9 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: We'll take our break now, so don't discuss the matter among yourselves or with any other 10 11 person and don't form or express any opinions. THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands at 12 recess. 13 14 (Whereupon, the jury leaves the courtroom.) (Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., a recess is taken.) 15 (Whereupon, the jury enters the courtroom.) 16 17 THE CLERK: We're back in session. MR. CHALOS: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 19 BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming) 20 Mr. Greiner, I'd like to go back to my last question. Do you recall the question that I asked you? 21 22 No, sir. The question is that if Captain Hazelwood was 23 24 truly intent on getting this vessel off the reef by going 25 forward, as you believe he was --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- would you consider it reasonable to then assume, as an expert, that he would use the fullest power available for him to do that?

MR. COLE: Objection, speculation.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: He may choose not to because he may feel that if he used that amount, that if he needed that amount in order to move the vessel, it could damage the vessel.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

- Q Well, wouldn't he then be acting prudently by using less than the full power, if that's what he was concerned about?
  - A I don't consider going forward at all as prudent.
- Q All right, let's talk about that then. You can't tell us, sitting here today, whether using his engines at 55 rpms could have moved the vessel one inch, let alone 450 feet that you said would be necessary before he risked damaging his engine.
  - A You are correct.
  - Q I take it you're not a salvage expert.
  - A That's correct.
- Q And you wouldn't hold yourself out as an expert on salvage.

-

A No, sir, I wouldn't.

Q Would you agree, though, that the holing that you saw in San Diego occurred either in your hypothetical first or second hit?

A Yes.

Q Now you spoke about the rudder being used after the grounding.

A Yes, sir.

O Okay. And you spoke about a calculation that you made that the vessel's head move something like 94 feet as a result.

A Yes, sir.

Q I take it you assume that that was all done as a result of rudder movement.

A Yes, sir.

O Did you in any way figure that perhaps the ship's heading was changed by the tide coming in and the vessel pivoting on the rock?

A Did I consider it? Yes, I did. The report for the tides and currents in that area are weak and negligible and if there was a current in that area, I would only expect it to move the vessel in one direction and not back again.

Q Did you come to any conclusion -- strike that.

You said that the use of the rudder, in your opinion, was

captain, no. I've navigated a lot of vessels. 1 I thought what you told us earlier was that you 2 3 were a chief engineer. No, you asked me a specific point in time on a 4 specific vessel. That's correct. I've sailed as a deck officer on two other vessels and I've gone aboard other ones, buoy tenders and, for instance, I've taken a buoy tender through Wrangle Narrows as a navigating officer. 8 That was back in the '50s. 9 Q '60s. 10 Α Early '60s, late '60s? 11 Q Mid-'60s. 12 I take it in those instances, you weren't 13 grounded. No, sir. 15 And you weren't the commanding officer. 16 That's correct. 17 And whatever decisions that would have been made 18 if that vessel ran aground would have been made by the 19 commanding officer. 20 After it went aground? 21

22

Q Yes.

23

Oh, absolutely.

24

Now you said even though you don't know whether this vessel was capable of moving an inch, you said that

the risk you perceived was that if this vessel moved forward 450 feet, the engine room would be holed.

A Yes.

- Q But you didn't do any calculations to see if that would in any way affect the stability of this vessel, did you?
  - A I don't have to.
  - Q You don't have to. Why not?
- A I know it will affect the stability of the vessel. If you put water in the engine room, it's certainly going to affect the stability of the vessel.
- Q Well, in what way would it affect it, did you calculate that?
- A I didn't calculate it, no. I didn't need to calculate it.
- Q And you said that -- strike that. Just to clear something up, you used the term gyro when you were referring to the course recorder.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q What you're talking about there is the gyro compass on the vessel, rather than the automatic mike, am I correct?
- A Yes, that is correct, it's -- the input for the course recorder comes from the gyro compass.
  - Q Sir, in response to -- before I ask you that, you

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

inspection, yes.

Q And you were the ranking officer when you went on

1 board? 2 Α Yes, I was. 3 The ship was on fire? The ship was on fire. Α You had to make some quick decisions, didn't you? Q 6 Yes. There were certain risks that were involved. 7 Q Α Yes. 8 9 And you made the decisions. Q 10 Α Yes. Somebody got killed, didn't they? 11 Q 12 Yes. And another guy got seriously injured. C 13 That's correct. 14 Α MR. COLE: Your Honor, I'm going to object as to 15 the relevance of that line of questioning and move to 16 strike. 17 MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, the relevance is that --18 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: No, I don't want an offer of 19 proof in front of the jury, based on what I've heard so 20 far. Approach the bench, please. 21 (The following was said at the bench.) 22 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, your motion to strike is 23 denied and you waived it by not making objections to 24 relevance when the questions were asked. As to further 25

3

4

5 6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

questions, what are you going to try to show with further auestions?

MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay

MR. COLE: I'm going to waive my objection. he's not going to strike it, then I'll proceed (inaudible).

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Well, the problem with this is Mr. Cole didn't have notice of what you were going to ask. The fact that he was involved in an accident in which somebody may have been killed is bringing up a prior act (inaudible) and I don't know what its probative value is in this case. Probably, you should have brought it to my attention, "I'd like to bring up something he was engaged in before."

MR. CHALOS: (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, you've explored it far enough. I've overruled the objection and I'm going to sustain the objection to further inquiry in this area.

(The following was said in open Court.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: The objection as to relevance is sustained to any further inquiry in this area.

> BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Captain Greiner, I take it you've had situations as the captain of the port and as a Coast Guard officer where you had to make quick decisions under very trying

Yes, sir.

Α |

Q And I suppose, sometimes, things are done right and things are not in the course of events.

A Hopefully, they're done right.

Q And -- but you don't know that at the moment that you're doing it. It's only in hindsight that you go back and say, "Well, perhaps I would have done something differently."

A Yes, but you're trained and -- in other words, the type of job you are in is something that you're trained for and you're trained for the unusual. And so when it comes along, usually, you're prepared for it, you fought it out in advance, even though it may be an emergency.

Q Captain Greiner, in that regard, looking back on the casualty now, would you agree that this was a major casualty, the grounding of the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes.

Q And would you also agree that it was a major salvage operation?

A Yes.

Q And would you agree that the type of casualty and type of salvage operation that we're talking about goes beyond any training that a crew member on a ship would have, captain or otherwise?

3

11

the location of the damage is and how the vessel shifts?

A Yes, absolutely, and the normal method of doing it is to take soundings around the vessel, using a lead line.

To determine what the depth of water is in the various spots, you look at your --

Q Let's just slow down here. Would you explain to the jury what a lead line is?

A Okay, a lead line is a line with a piece of lead on the end of it and you go around to various positions in the vessel and you lower -- you can feel when the lead hits the bottom. In other words --

Q Various positions on the level, you mean on the edge of the --

A Edge of the ship, I'm sorry, on the edge of the ship. And you can feel when it hits the bottom and it's marked so that you can tell what the depth is.

Q Okay, let me just give you an example. If a vessel were sitting like -- set that thing. How would the lead line if the vessel was sitting like this, in other words, open water here and in front?

A You walk around the vessel and you drop the lead line and you measure the depth of water here. You know what the draft of the vessel is, itself. And since the depth of water is greater than the draft of the vessel, you know the vessel isn't sitting on the bottom there. And you

do the same thing as you go around and up here, you're going to find that your draft and your depth of water are identical, so you'll know that the vessel is aground at that area. And you can work your way on around and do the thing, do that all the way around the vessel.

Q Now Mr. Chalos asked you about the reconstruction there. What evidence did you have through the information that was provided to you that the track line you made there was consistent with the track line -- with the physical information?

Well, we have a number of things. You start out with the position of the grounding, with the position of Busby Light, with the position here of Buoy 9, with the position coming off of — out of Valdez Narrows. There are two other positions in here which not much is said about. Then you take the track line and run it along the course and over those, go back and check and see if your speeds that you've calculated match those and if they do match, that's a confirmation of it.

You have to weigh the various pieces of information, too, because they won't always agree. For instance, times don't always agree. Various clocks are set at different times. You'll notice in the spread sheet that there's a difference between the bell log and the bell logger of a minute or two minutes. But taking all those

2

4

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

into consideration, then you come down with a track line that best fits all of the information.

Q Is there certain inaccuracies with just the course recorder, itself?

Yes, sir. I pointed out here that there is probably a one-degree error here and, of course, the course recorder is run by a clock. We don't know that the clock that the course recorder is run by is identical to the clock which other things, for instance the rpm, were kept by. There is, here, a question as to whether there is an error in time. In other words, NTSB has approximately a minute -- their chart is a minute different than this one. I don't know whether they found that this was an error, in other words, the times here were in error by one minute, and corrected theirs for that. But you will notice that there is a difference between -- and you can see right here that there's -- that's about a minute two, and I think they should minute -- I say minute two -- minute -- at 10:00 --11:42 or :42-1/2, where the NTSB one shows it about a minute earlier than that.

Q Now what about the course recorder's accuracy when it's on the edges of quadrants?

A When it's on the edges of quadrants, this is the area where play in the mechanism will most show up. I guess I should point out here, too, that it went above, at

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

you've drawn in this case?

Α

Yes, it would.

11

12 13

15

18

17

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

The rudder orders that people gave, did you see any evidence in the course recorder that any rudder orders were executed before 12:01, while it was on 180, after it steadied up?

- No, sir. ·A
- Would that include the period 11:56, 11:57, 11:58?
- Yes, sir, it's constant there.
- Is there any way to reconstruct exactly the turn that the Exxon, the course that the Exxon Valdez took out that port that day?
  - No, sir, there isn't, not that I'm aware of.
  - And what have you tried to do in this?
- I tried to give a general representation for the -- so that the jury could understand the track line of the vessel and where different events occurred and putting in times there.
- Now Mr. Chalos asked you about the damage that witnesses had testified to. If Mr. Radtke had indicated that he had heard a sound coming that seem to travel from the bow to the stern, would that be consistent with the damage that you observed in this matter?
  - Yes, sir. Α
- Now these charts that we have here, how accurate are they, as far as fathom marks? Do you know when these were made?

, 9

A No, I don't. I've been involved with charting, chart analysis before because when the ARCO Anchorage went aground, there was a question as to the type of bottom and where rocks were and such like that and I had the occasion to talk to the cartographers back in Washington, D.C. And with charts that are older charts, there may be rocks in between where they've taken the soundings. With the newer ones, there usually aren't; they're done with a different method.

Q Did you use the various testimony of witnesses about rudder commands that they said were ordered and executed in coming to your conclusions?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, leading the witness.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: The primary thing that I used was the actual course recorder because this shows the response of the vessel. Whether a command was given or not is not really relevant; it's whether it was executed. And if it's executed, it's shown by the course recorder.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Can you tell the rudder angle that was ordered from the track line of the course recorder?

A No, sir.

Q Can anybody?

A They -- no, they can't tell what's ordered. They may be able to analyze the average of what was given, but not what was ordered.

Q Did you have to reach any -- did you have to make any calculations as to the horsepower of this engine to determine whether or not Captain Hazelwood created a risk of further damage by trying to move this thing ahead?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, foundation, leading.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: No, sir, I didn't.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Why is that?

A The -- because as one sits on the bridge, one doesn't know how deeply impaled the vessel is and the amount of horsepower to get it off can't be calculated sitting on the bridge. Full power, full maneuvering power is a significant amount of power and if it was able to move the vessel, could have caused additional damage.

- Q You indicated that you did not see damage done from the twisting motion of the vessel.
  - A That's correct.
  - Q What are the reasons for that?

A It could be that the plates were missing or that the area was compressed later from sitting on the rock.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Cole, that seems like a

little deviation from what you'd normally be using an exhibit for.

MR. COLE: Well, it's because I'm not admitting it through this witness, Your Honor. I'm just having Captain Greiner identify this.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Are you proposing you're going to admit it through some other witness after this witness has indicated it's improper, something is incorrect about it?

MR. COLE: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, then you've laid a foundation that it's incorrect and you're going to try to admit this through another witness.

MR. COLE: Right.

MR. CHALOS: Well, Your Honor, I would object because I think any witness he would admit it through would be one of his own witnesses. It's not something that's drawn by our witnesses.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Is it something that the defense witness you intend -- you expect to propose admission on?

Don't show it to the jury. Don't show it to the jury. No, just answer my question. When you say you expect to admit it through another witness, is it through your own witness?

MR. COLE: Yes.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay. All right, do you still

- A No, sir, nor even reprimanded.
- Q And you weren't court marshaled for the Protectus Alpha matter, were you?
- A That's right, I wasn't in charge of the firefighting on there.
- Q Now you spoke about soundings. You said that you would take soundings to determine how the vessel was aground, is that right?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Well, a sounding wouldn't tell you what the vessel—how the vessel is aground, would it? It would just tell you what the water is around the vessel, right? In other words, if she was aground in the center of the vessel, underneath, soundings wouldn't tell you anything in that regard because you could have good water on either side.
- A Theoretically, you could have a pinnacle and the ship was on the middle of the pinnacle and you have deep water on either side, I would agree with that, you could.
- Q And the only way to know how you're hung up in that situation is to use your rudder, not to take soundings.
  - A No, sir, it isn't.
  - Q It isn't?
  - A No.

- Q That's your opinion.
- A Absolutely.
- Q Based again on --
- A That's not the only way to do it, no.
- Q But it's one of the ways to do it, isn't it?
- A It would work.
- Q Okay. Now just to clear something up again, would you agree with me that if the vessel was in 38 fathoms of water at five minutes after midnight, in this case, that your theory of the vessel striking at that time would be incorrect?
- A I think it's five and three-quarter minutes or something like that.
  - Q Let's say six minutes.
- A Six minutes, and it depends on whose clock your using. Yes, if it's in 38 fathoms of water, it's not going to be aground.
- Q Okay. Now you spoke a little bit about the clocks. You had an opportunity to look at the clocks on this ship, didn't you?
  - A Yes.
  - Q That was on April 2d?
  - A Yes.
- Q And you said in one of the reports that you wrote, even though you didn't test the clocks, you believe that

li

they were essentially correct.

A I don't remember that I said, but if you would refresh my recollection, I'd appreciate it.

Q Yes, I will.

A I think you misquoted me. I'd prefer the whole sentence to be read.

Q Right.

A Okay, in answer to your question, what I said is the clocks on the vessel, although apparently operating, were not checked for accuracy, since they had all been reset for daylight savings time the day before I came aboard. So the check was -- there's no ascertation of accuracy of the clocks.

Q Well, I take it, though, if you wanted to check them at that point, you certainly could have done it to see if there was any difference between the clocks, is that right?

A Certainly I could have, but that wouldn't prove anything.

Q Now, again, when you plotted that track line, you said that you used certain empirical data and the empirical data that you used was all prior to 2355, is that right, in terms of fixes that were taken by the vessel and other --

A No, sir.

Q That's not correct.

20

21

22

23

24

25

A That's not correct.

Q Okay, let me bring you down then to what you marked as 0002 --

A Yes.

Q -- two minutes after midnight.

A Yes.

Q Okay, it's at that point that the vessel started to use some rudder.

A Yes.

Q But you told us, though, that subsequent to that point in time, you didn't calculate how much rudder was used.

A That's correct.

Q And certainly the rudder would -- the use of the rudder would affect the speed.

A Yes.

Q Okay, so anything after 0002 might or might not accurate on this particular chart, depending on what rudder you were using.

A You asked me before whether I used everything that was -- all the things that were before that and I answered your question no. And the reason I answered it no is because this position here is one of the positions used.

Q Right.

A And that's where we've got to end up. That's

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Q Seven, okay. What I'm saying to you, though, you didn't go back to 0002 and calculate, minute by minute, the movement of this vessel, using the --

A Angle of rudder.

Q Right.

A That is correct, I did not.

Q Now Mr. Cole asked you, by looking at the course recorder --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- you can't tell -- there's no indication of rudder orders being given before a minute and a half after midnight, right?

A Yes, sir.

Q It's true, is it not, that the course recorder wouldn't tell you when an order was given? It only tells you when an order is carried out.

A That is correct.

Q Okay. So to be more accurate, what the course

recorder is showing you is the moment that the vessel's heading is changed.

A And that's the way I answered the question, yes, sir.

- Q Yes. And, in fact, Mr. Cousins could have given an order to the helmsman at 2355, 11:55, and the helmsman didn't carry it out for five minutes, that could have happened.
  - A That could have happened.
  - Q And the course recorder won't tell you that.
  - A You're right.
- Q Now, Mr. Cole asked you about Mr. Radtke's testimony, where he said he felt the sensation that appeared to him to be something starting forward and working its way back.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q Do you also remember reading that Mr. Radtke said the whole thing took about 15 to 20 seconds?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q You didn't read that.
- A I didn't read Radtke's. He gave me a portion of what Radtke was supposed to have said. I've not read the rest of it.
- Q And Mr. Cole didn't give you the portion that said he only felt it for about 15 or 20 seconds?

*7* 

A No, sir.

Q Now that would be inconsistent with your theory, wouldn't it, if that's all he felt it?

A If the vessel was stopped at the end of 15 seconds and if it went aground in 15 seconds and then it was stopped at the end of 15 seconds, it would be inconsistent, yes.

Q Now you said that these particular charts, the soundings, are not accurate. I take it -- you were out to the ship on the 2d of April. You didn't take the opportunity to take soundings of the area, in effect, bolster the argument that you're making or the opinion that you're giving here?

A Your question starts with a misquotation of what I said. I didn't say the soundings were inaccurate.

Q What did you say?

A I said that the -- there may be other things in between the soundings that don't show up. In other words, in some cases, these are taken with a bottom, straight bottom sounding fathometer or, in some cases, maybe with a lead line, although I doubt in that depth of water. And it may not indicate something that is a short distance away.

Q But bottom line, though, you didn't do any soundings yourself.

A That's correct.

Q You said you didn't have to make any calculations to determine if Captain Hazelwood created a risk by using the engine here, is that right?

A That's correct.

Would you agree that the risk is only created in those situations where something would happen as a result of your actions?

MR. COLE: Objection, speculation and misstatement of the law.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I'm going to let the question stand. We'll clear this up with the jury instructions.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Q In other words, before you can assume that a risk exists, the actor who's supposedly creating the risk has to be capable of doing something. Would you agree with that?

A Has to be capable of doing it? Certainly he doesn't have to have the results. I don't know whether he has to -- under the law, I don't know whether he has to be capable of it or not. He may attempt to do something, believing he can do it, and the fact that it isn't physically possible I don't think -- you're asking me to interpret the law and I don't know.

Q Let me put it to you this way. You said here the risk that Captain Hazelwood was creating was rubbing his ship forward 450 feet and damaging the engine room, right?

4

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Or laterally.

But 450 feet.

No, no, no. No, no, no. When he moves this from side to side, there could be a rock alongside the stern of the vessel which when he used the rudder, it could come up against and it could hole the engine room or hole a different part of the vessel.

You don't know, sitting here today, whether in fact there was a rock.

No, sir.

Okay. So what you do know, though, he would have to move 450 feet forward to damage the engine room, at least as far as that risk is concerned.

As far as the rock that it was sitting on is concerned, yes.

Well, before you could say that he created that kind of risk, wouldn't you need to know that he was capable of doing that?

MR. COLE: Objection, asked and answered.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You're invading the Court's province. I'll instruct on the law in this area. witness is not qualified to give that answer. Objection sustained.

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Now you said that full maneuvering speed on this Q

22

23

24

25

vessel is significant power, is that what you said?

- I used that word, yes.
- You're a former chief engineer or the equivalent of a former chief engineer.
  - Yes, sir.
- Is it your testimony that you didn't bother to find out what the power curves were on this vessel?
  - No, sir.
- Don't you think that would be important to -- in order to come to the conclusion that you came, that is knowing what power this vessel had at 55 rpms?
- Well, it's sufficient power to drive a vessel of large size at 12 knots.
- Well, running at 12 knots is not the same thing as being aground, would you agree?
  - You're correct.
  - You're correct, I agree.
- So before you can say that it was significant power, you'd have to first figure out how many tons were aground and how much thrust would be needed to move that, wouldn't you?
- If you are -- you're saying that you would have to calculate it. In hindsight, that might be true. You might be able to calculate it and say that it would have been

impossible for him to do what I perceive he was trying to do.

Q Well, has anyone told you that it was impossible, it would have been impossible for him to do what you perceive he was trying to do?

A I think that I said that I agreed that it was impossible because he attempted to move the vessel and didn't, so that it doesn't take somebody else to interpret it. It didn't move.

Q Wasn't it also impossible because the thrust that would have been required to move this vessel just an inch was so great that this vessel's engines, even running at full sea speed ahead, couldn't generate even 99 percent of the thrust that was required?

A With hindsight, that can be said, yes, I agree. In other words, we know that there is a large area in contact and the power didn't overcome it. The acts speak for themselves; it didn't move.

Q Did Mr. Cole explain the law, as it relates to risk, to you, creation of a risk?

A No, sir.

Q He didn't.

A Well, he explained it to the extent that he said that the results don't have to occur, it's the risk that's involved, and that's the extent of which --

That's how he explained the law to you?

0

1

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Mr. Chalos indicated one scenario of why this vessel didn't turn until 12:02. Are there other scenarios of why this vessel didn't turn until 12:02? He said that if Mr. Cousins had given an order and Mr. Kagan had not followed it, the vessel wouldn't have turned. Are there other reasons why that could happen?

MR. CHALOS: Your Honor, if I may object, my question went to -- in response to Mr. Cole's question which was no rudder orders were given until 12:02. I wanted to clear up that you can't tell that from looking at the course recorder. I wasn't getting into any other area in that regard.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Objection overruled. You may answer the question.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Are there other reasons?

Yes. Α

Would you tell the jury what those would be?

Α That the orders weren't given at that time or they weren't given until later.

How about whether -- would it make a difference whether the vessel was on automatic pilot or on gyro?

MR. CHALOS: Objection, Your Honor, this is going beyond cross, recross.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: No, I don't think so, I think you brought that up. Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, if it's on gyro or automatic steering, movements of the helm will not result in a movement of the rudder and there's no alarm on it.

Q I have nothing else, thank you.

MR. CHALOS: Just two quick questions.

### FURTHER RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CHALOS: (Resuming)

Q Mr. Greiner, did you read the testimony of Mr. Cousins and Mr. Kagan to the effect that they took this vessel off gyro at 20 -- at 11:53?

A I didn't read the testimony of Mr. Kagan at all and the testimony of Mr. Cousins, I don't remember the exact time, but I remember that he said he had taken it off, yes.

Q Okay. There's no indication, by looking at the course recorder, or you have no reason to believe that the vessel was on gyro after 11:53, do you, by looking at the course recorder?

A I can't answer that with the degree of accuracy I'd like to.

MR. CHALOS: No further questions.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: May the witness be excused? Pardon me?

#### VOLUME 19

### STATE OF ALASKA

### IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AT ANCHORAGE

In the Matter of:

STATE OF ALASKA

versus

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JOSEPH J. HAZELWOOD

Case No. 3ANS89-7217

Case No. 3ANS89-7218

Anchorage, Alaska February 27, 1990

The above-entitled matter came on for trial by jury before the Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, commencing at 8:56 o'clock a.m., on February 27, 1990. This transcript was prepared from tapes recorded by the Court.

### APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the State:

BRENT COLE, Assistant District Attorney MARY ANN HENRY, Assistant District Attorney

On behalf of the Defendant:

RICHARD MADSON, Esq. MICHAEL CHALOS, Esq.

23

24

25

PRO-TYPISTS, INC. Professional Transcription Service (202) | 347-5395

•

# $\underline{\mathsf{C}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{O}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{E}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{S}}$

WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
STATE				
Steven Tuttle	4	14		
Robert A. Beevers	20	120		

## <u>**E** X H I B I T S</u>

STATE'S FOR IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDENCE

## PROCEEDINGS

10+	-			
(Start	Tape	C-36	543	)

THE COUNT

THE COURT: Mr. Cole, are you ready with your next witness?

MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, the State would call Steve Tuttle.

Whereupon,

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### STEVEN TUTTLE

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full name and then spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: Steven Tuttle, T-U-T-T-L-E.

THE CLERK: And your current business mailing address?

THE WITNESS: 605 West 4th Avenue, Room 57, Anchorage, 99501.

THE CLERK: And your current occupation, sir?

THE WITNESS: With the Division of law Enforcement, Special Agent, employed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. HENRY:

Q Sir, how long have you been with the Fish and

6

7

8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

A I have been employed by the Fish and Wildlife Service for approximately eleven years.

- Q And as a special agent during those eleven years?
- A No. As a special agent I have been employed for approximately six and a half years.
  - Q What are your responsibilities?

A The responsibilities of a special agent would be one of a criminal investigator, which would involve investigating violations of Federal wildlife laws.

- Q Is part of your department's responsibility as a result of the oil spill caused by the grounding of the Exxon Valdez, the collection and inventory of animals and birds that were killed as a result of the oil spill?
- A Yes, it was. One of our primary duties was just that.

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I am going to object to this testimony. It's totally irrelevant.

THE COURT: Objection overruled, Mr. Madson.

BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming)

- Q Go ahead. Was that one of your responsibilities?
- A Yes, that is correct.
- Q Was it also one of the department's responsibilities to oversee the rehabilitation centers for the live birds and otters?

3

.5

6

′

Ü

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A That is correct.

Q Were spill coordinators assigned to different areas?

A Yes, approximately the first week in May, oil spill coordinators were assigned to various locations including Seward, Homer, Kodiak and Valdez.

Q Now what would happen if someone found an animal or a bird that appeared to have been killed as a result of the oil spill?

A The collection system that was established had those individuals transfer those animals, whether they are live or dead, to a representative of the Fish and Wildlife Service and that individual would catalog by species and store, if it's a dead animal, in a secure location, if it's a live animal, we would make sure the animal had proper care and was sent to an existing rehab facility.

Q All right.

Were statistics kept as to the number of animals that had been killed by the oil spill, and birds?

A Yes. Part of the collection process involved the cataloging, and each oil spill coordinator was responsible for tallying those totals and reporting those totals to our regional office.

Q And then the regional office would have a grand total?

A That's correct.

22

23

24

published, it probably is in the way of newspaper articles, things of that nature.

- Q And have you reviewed the statistics in that report?
- A Yes, I have.
- Q And based upon your personal knowledge and your responsibilities in overseeing portions of this, are those statistics accurate?
- A If the oil spill coordinators followed the collection and cataloging procedures which were initiated by law enforcement personnel, then those figures would be reasonably correct.
- Q Do you have any reason to believe that they would not have followed the procedures you set up?
  - A No, I do not.
- Q How many birds were killed as a result of the Exxon Valdez oil spill?
- MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I will still make the same objection.

THE COURT: It sounds like it is going to be based on something he has read or heard from something else. It's not a public document, because we're not admitting the document here. Do you wish to be heard any further on your --

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, in that case I would attempt to admit the public document. May I approach the Court?

THE COURT: You can have it marked and proceed

further. But do you want to be heard any further on the objection of hearsay as to his testimony?

MS. HENRY: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, this witness is in the enforcement arm of the department, and as part of that was -- set up the procedures that would be followed by the individual oil spill coordinators in each city in order to make sure that the animals, live and dead, were collected, and that appropriate statistics were kept. The oil spill coordinators then, following these procedures, would keep the statistics and then turn them in to the regional coordinator who actually prepared this document.

Under 803 Subsection 8, which is a case in exception to the hearsay rule, being public records and reports, this would be included as a public record or report, kept by a public agency during its ordinary course of duties. And the factual findings in the report were resulting from an investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law.

Additionally, the statistics are a combination of statistical information compiled by several oil spill coordinators, and under Rule 1006, which indicates summaries of voluminous writings can be put into one document. And therefore under the public records exception and the 1006, which indicates summaries can be introduced, I would request that either the witness be permitted to give the bottom line

figures or that the document of the statistical summary be introduced, which is Exhibit 158.

THE COURT: All right.

The witness will not be permitted to testify. It is hearsay what he has to say. I don't know about that document at this point. If that's all you have for it, the document will be permitted in either as a public record. It sounds to me from what you said it's an investigative report by law enforcement personnel or an investigative report prepared for the government. When offered by in the case in which its a party, these are not within the exceptions to the hearsay rule under Subsection B of the rule.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, I am not introducing it as an investigatory report, I'm introducing it as a public record of statistics kept by a public agency in the course of their duties.

THE COURT: Well, so far you haven't laid a sufficient foundation for it. The objection is sustained.

MS. HENRY: All right.

BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming)

- Q Sir, the oil spill coordinators were required to keep statistics of birds or animals that were turned in to them, whether live or dead, is that correct?
  - A That is correct.
  - Q And how was that procedure set up?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α Before the oil spill coordinators were assigned, law enforcement personnel were dispatched to the various locations, Valdez, Homer, Seward, Kodiak. At that point I was dispatched to Seward and I initiated the deployment of personnel, be they volunteers or employed by the oil spill clean up companies. And there was a certain procedure which they had to follow, and that was in the even of collecting dead animals, they would designate on a map where it was It would be collected en masse at a central collected. repository when they returned from being out at sea. We would then assume that property. We would inventory all the property by species. Being that these animals were very much covered with oil, it was difficult to ascertain species. For someone not familiar with bird identification, it would be very difficult for them to ascertain what species. Fish and Wildlife individuals were called in.

In doing that inventory system, a written sheet -- a written tally was kept for all the dead animals. And each day that tally, that total of that day would be called into the regional office. I personally did such inventories and the tallies for dead birds in quantities that ran from anywhere from one hundred to close to four hundred birds a day.

Then law enforcement personnel, through a rotational basis, would continue this process, continue to keep the tallies, until the oil spill coordinators were assigned to

1 1

12

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

each location, at which point law enforcement personnel were excused from that duty. The oil spill coordinators then continued that same process of maintaining that log, that tally of animals, both live and dead.

- Q Was it made clear to first the agents and then the oil spill coordinators that it was their duty to keep these tallies and to report them to the regional oil spill coordinator?
  - A Yes.
- Q And as a part of the responsibility of your business -- your department to maintain information regarding the status of wild animals and birds in the State of Alaska?
- Q For species that the Fish and Wildlife Service has jurisdiction over, yes.
  - Q And that would include?
  - A Migratory birds.
  - Q Would it also include any marine animals?
- A Yes, marine mammals including sea otters and polar bear and walrus. The Fish and Wildlife Service has primary jurisdiction over those marine mammals.
- Q And showing you what has been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 158 for identification, would you once again identify what that is?
- A Looking at Plaintiff Exhibit Number 158, this is a cumulative summary of totals provided by the U.S. Fish and

. .

Wildlife Service of birds, sea otters, eagles, both live and dead, that had been affected by oil.

Q Is it also broken down by region?

A It is broken down by the regions Kodiak, Homer, Seward and Valdez.

- Q And is that document available to the public?
- A Yes, it is.

MS. HENRY: Your Honor, at this time I would once again move into evidence Exhibit 158 under Subsection 8 of Rule 803, that this is a public record. It is a data compilation from a public office or agency setting forth its regularly conducted and regularly recorded activities or matters observed pursuant to duty imposed by laws to which there was a duty to report, or factual findings resulting from investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law.

MR. MADSON: I have the same objection, your Honor. I don't believe this witness is the person who has the foundation and the knowledge necessary to show whether that's a public document or not. It doesn't purport to state that and I think we need -- a public document, has to be somebody that had access to it and made it public, and I don't think that's been shown.

Secondly and more importantly, I would renew my objection under Rule 403 that even though it may be marginally relevant, it is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice,

waste of time, and goes into other issues which are certainly not important here. Captain Hazelwood isn't charged with killing birds or anything of that sort.

THE COURT: The relevancy objection is overruled. it is probative on one of the elements of the case, the statements prove here. And as to a public record, I am going to overrule your objection on that, Mr. Madson. It comes in under 803 (8) at this time.

(State's Exhibit Number 158 was admitted in evidence.)

### BY MS. HENRY: (Resuming)

- Q In reviewing that document, sir, you have already indicated that that document includes animals that were collected alive and also animals and birds that were collected dead, is that correct?
  - A Yes, it does.
- Q And this is also divided into the different areas, is that right?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Are there subtotals and grand totals on these stats?
- A On this there appears both subtotals as per collection region and grand totals at the bottom of the page.
- Q Now how many birds have been killed as a result of the Exxon Valdez oil spill, total?
  - A Cumulative grand total for dead birds, 36,471.

as totals. I have seen that in newspaper articles.

25

Q Just parts -- what's the purpose of just having parts of it released and not all of it?

A Apparently there is some interest as to how many birds and how many otters were impacted by the oil.

- Q And in that regard, what statute do you operate under that requires you to accumulate totals of birds? Or migratory birds or anything that would have been injured or killed by the oil spill?
- A We were acting under the authority of Title 16 United States Code 703.
- Q And that just keeps data collection, is that what it is?
  - A No, it addresses the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
- Q So what does it do? What are you supposed to do under that Treaty Act? You enforce -- let me\_\_\_\_\_.

  You're an enforcement officer, right?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q And you work for the State of Alaska?
  - A No, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Q Oh, I'm sorry. The Fish and Wildlife Service. You would enforce let's say hunters are out there killing way too many migratory birds, for instance, even though it may be legally in the season, are you involved with illegal hunting, let's put it that way?
  - A Yes, among others, yes.

 Q And then you just -- you basically keep status of how many birds, let's say, are killed in a hunting season, what variety types?

A No, not necessarily. Anything that impacts a species that the Federal government -- meaning U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service -- has jurisdiction over, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has jurisdiction over, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Law Enforcement would have the authority to look into, be that an oil spill or be that hunting. It could mean anything as far as far as any environmental condition, man or natural, that impacts a Federally protected species.

- Q Well, who owns these birds and mammals?
- A The people of the United States.
- Q In other words, they are not owned by the State of Alaska as far as you know?
  - A No, they are not.
  - Q They are not property of the State of Alaska?
  - A No, they're --

MR. MADSON: Well, your Honor, I would renew my objection at this time based on the witnesses answers. They are not State property, there is no damage, there's no dollars, and that's what this case is all about, it's risk of damage of over \$100,000. And this has absolutely nothing to do with it. It is strictly for prejudicial value.

THE COURT: All right, you may be heard now.

,

MS. HENRY: Thank you, your Honor. With regard to the last objection, it doesn't \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ that the State must prove, and that is that the risk of damage by widely dangerous means occurred, and that State must show that the oil spill must show that the oil spill was a widely dangerous means. Widely dangerous means definition includes definitions of poisonous things, and showing how many animals were killed as a result of the oil spill shows that the oil spill is a widely dangerous means.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Madson, I see no reason to change my ruling at this time. You went to foundation on it and the objection is overruled. The testimony stands.

Now are you finished with the witness at this time?

MR. MADSON: Just one last question perhaps.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

Q Sir, if the animal dies as a result of oil, let's take a sea otter for instance, the oil coats the outside of the animal, correct?

A Yes.

Q And then it allows or requires -- not requires, but it -- the animal will die because it loses its heat insulation value of its coat, it that correct?

25

### ROBERT A. BEEVERS

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and

documents for the State, and give them my -- my knowledge in

25

the maritime field in determining what happened.

Q Would you tell the jury how long have you been involved in the maritime industry?

A Okay. I first started to sea in 1963, and as an unlicensed seaman. 1967, I got my original -- my third mate's license. And 1973 I got my master's license. And I sailed steady -- steady from 1963 to 1987 when I retired.

Q Did you attend any maritime schools to get your license, third mate's license?

A I didn't attend a maritime academy. I went to a -- a school sponsored by the Master, Mates and Pilot's Union that lasted sixty, ninety days, something like that, and which you have an intensive study period on just the duties of a third mate and the navigation -- the various things required by the Coast Guard to take and pass the test.

Q We've heard testimony that some tanker captains, masters, have attended school -- a maritime school, academy, and have gotten their third mate's license after graduation. How was your acquiring of your third mate's license different?

A Well, in order for me to sit for third mate's license, I had to have a minimum of three year's sea time on deck, had to have an able seaman ticket, and then take the --well, it was the same test that a graduate of a maritime academy would take to pass the third mate's exam.

O So it would be just a little bit different route to

A Yes.

4 | 5 |

Q Since 1980 -- 1973 when you began working as a master, how much or your career -- well, let me ask you this. How much of your career has been spent working on oil tankers?

A From the time I got my third mate's license, I made one trip on a freighter -- my first trip on a license was on a victory ship, maybe 65 days --

What's a victory ship?

A Oh, that's an old freighter, a World War II type freighter. Captain Hazelwood knows, I am sure, about victory ships, too. But then my only other freighter was in 1985. I was captain on a small freighter that went to Antarctica. And other than that, all of my sea time has been on tankers.

Q How much time have you -- have you worked in the Prince William Sound trade?

A Okay. I originally came up in 1977, when they were just preparing to open the pipeline and they -- the oil companies had chartered three vessels to make trips in and out of Prince William Sound so that all the captains that were going to be involved in the tankers could get their pilotage for Prince William Sound. And I did that and obtained my pilotage. And then within a year after that -- let's see, in the latter part of '78, I believe -- I was on the Overseas Juneau on my first trip in and out of Prince William Sound.

ر

And from that point on, with the exception of the freighter trip, basically it has been Prince William Sound to Long Beach, Prince William Sound to Panama, that trade.

- Q The time that you got your pilotage, was there a group of tanker captains aboard with you that time?
  - A Yes. They --
  - Q Explain how that happened.

A Well, like I say, they were planning on opening the pipeline. Prince William Sound wasn't a place that too many large ships frequented up to that point. So it had been determined by the Coast Guard that pilotage was going to be required from Cape Hinchinbrook into the dock. And an agreement between the State pilot association and the Alyeska Terminal and the oil companies, it evolved that they would go from Rocky Point to the dock, and the ships captains would get pilotage from Cape Hinchinbrook to Rocky Point.

So they chartered these vessels while they were waiting for the pipeline to open and made trip after trip in and out of Prince William Sound so that everyone could make the required number of trips that they needed and then set for a test and pass a pilot's test.

- Q Would you give the jury an estimate of how many trips you made in and out of Prince William Sound while you were working that trade?
  - A Okay.

3

5 6

7

10

12

13

14 15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

It would be hard to say exactly, but I would say fifty, sixty maybe, something like that.

- Would you be working year round during those years?
- Yes. During that time my company had decided we would work -- to set the schedule, we would try to work four months on, four months off, four on. So that would effectively change the seasons where you would rotate winter, summer. Basically that was so we could each have a chance at having Christmas at home and change the seasons around.
- During your time period that you worked in the Prince William Sound trade, did you also act as a -- did you also -- were you also placed on vessels that didn't have pilotage?

Yes. As things worked out, we had -- had captains Α that were coming around to come in the trade that hadn't obtained their pilotage. And how on vacations I made trips on vessels for Maritime Overseas to ride with people that were getting the required trips for pilotage.

- What is Maritime Overseas?
- That was the company I worked for at the time.
- Q And did they own the tankers that you were respon -that you were the captain of?
  - A Yes.
- Back to the time that you were aiding in the piloting of these tankers, can you give the jury an idea of

how many times this would have occurred?

A I really can't now, but -- I really can't say. It wasn't a lot of trips as a pilot, but -- I don't know, from a few to several.

Q Now, did you take any trips other than through the Prince William Sound during that period of time? In and out of Prince William Sound. Did you make any trips to the Persian Gulf?

A Oh, yeah. Twice during that time on the Overseas

Juneau was diverted off from our Prince William Sound, West

Coast and Panama run, and went to the shipyards in Singapore

and from that point went to the Persian Gulf to pick up a load

of oil to take to a discharge port. In effect there what they

were doing was picking up a load of cargo so they didn't have

to make a trip back empty.

- Q Did you -- let's talk about some of your experience in ice. Have you made any trips to Antarctica?
- Q Yes. I made the one trip in 1985 on a freighter in which we left the United States and went to Antarctica to provide all the -- once a year they send a freighter down there to provide all the goods that the National Science Foundation and the people that are handling the logistics of all the scientific experiments going on need, and it's a once a year thing. You go down and they have sent a Coast Guard icebreaker down to break a path into the McMurdo Sound base,

and then we come down and follow the icebreaker in, discharge the cargo, and then come back out.

- Q Did you encounter icing conditions during that time?
- A Oh, yes, yes. Uh-huh.
- Q How about have you made any trips to the Soviet Union?

A Yes. During the -- a few years back when the tanker business was in a slump, there were several tankers cleaned up and used to carry grain to the Soviet Union. And I made several trips there. And this was back in the -- oh, early, mid-70's. And in one of those trips we were sent to Leningrad in February. And it was an unusually cold winter and the Baltic was froze and we followed an icebreaker in and out through the Baltic Sea, approximately 200 miles in and out, to go to Leningrad to discharge the load of grain.

Q Did you encounter icing conditions during your trips in and out of Prince William Sound?

A Yes. We would -- they would occasionally have ice coming off the Colombia Glacier and drifting out across the traffic lanes, yes.

Q Can you give the jury an idea were there certain periods where that was greater than others?

A Oh, yes, it varies from time to time. They'll -some trips you'd come in there were no ice at all. Other
trips you'd come in there was quite a bit of ice has calved

off and drifted out across the lanes. Sometimes it is a problem, sometimes it isn't.

Q What type of tankers were you operating in and out of Prince William Sound while you were in that trade?

A Okay. The first tanker that I was captain on was the Overseas Juneau. That was a 120,000 ton steam driven tanker. The next one that I was on just for a short period of time was the Overseas Ohio, which is a 90,000 ton, double hulled, steam tanker. Then I was on the Overseas Boston, which is a 121,000 ton diesel motor ship. And then the last ship I was on before I retired was the OMI Columbia. It's a 136,000 ton diesel.

Q Just a quick question about diesel vessels. How do you start and stop a diesel engine on these tankers?

A Well, they are controlled from a lever either on the bridge if you are in bridge control or a lever in the engine room that acts the same as the lever on the bridge. And how they -- how that's done as far as the bridge officer is concerned, you merely push the lever to what you -- if you want to stop, you push the lever to stop. And the reaction in the engine room is the fuel is cut off to the engine and it'll come to a stop. If you want to change -- if you want to restart or change directions, then it's -- you just push your lever to ahead. And to start the engine they have a reservoir of air which will kick it over for -- to get the engine moving

- Q Is there any warming up that needs to be done on a diesel?
- A Normally, everything is going right they normally have the lube oil heated up, they have the fuel heated. They need to heat the heavy fuel oil in order to be able to use it. And it's something you could start -- you could start a diesel cold, I believe, but normally they do keep them heated up. That is part of the engineer's duties in operating a ship.
- Q Where else have you acted -- have you traveled as master of tankers? Can you give the jury -- have there been other parts of the world that you have traveled as the master of a tanker?
- A Oh, yes. Years back now, I was chartered on -- some of the ships that I was on when I first got a master's license were chartered to the Navy on the Military Sealift Command and with that we went Persian Gulf to Vietnam to the Philippines, Guam, Hawaiian Islands. In Rota, Spain, for example. All over the world. Up and down the East Coast, the Caribbean area, in and out of almost every port that has a refinery there.
- Q Have you gotten -- your license, did you ever get pilotage in any other areas besides the Prince William Sound?
  - A Yes, Cook Inlet. During my time off in, I think, 82

10

13

14

12

15

17

18 . .

20

22

21

23

25

and 83, I made enough trips in Cook Inlet to qualify to set for a pilot's license for pilotage from sea to anchorage.

Q Now, during this time that you were working, who were you mainly employed by? During the time you were working in the Prince William Sound area?

A Okay.

My primary employer at that time was Maritime Overseas.

Q And how did Maritime Overseas operate? Did they own the oil, or how was their -- what was their capacity?

A No. How that works, they are strictly a transportation company that owns ships and they charter the ships to various oil companies either on a voyage charter or time charter, and carry oil for -- whatever, if it's a six month time charter for six months, they will make whatever trips that particular oil company wants. Or if it's a longer charter, two years, say, then it's the same thing.

And as the charters expire, they will put the tanker on the market for another charter and perhaps another oil company picks them up. So during that time I worked for -- on a ship that was chartered to Exxon, chartered to Sohio, chartered to ARCO, and Chevron and maybe some other companies. But those four I am sure that we were chartered to them at various times.

Q Would your responsibilities as a captain change

depending on which oil company you happen to be chartering for?

A No. Your master's responsibility is the same. What would change would be the various paperwork that each oil company required, and basically they are the same. They are just a different form but the same information is required.

Q Did you have any policy, operation, or bridge manuals that were handed out by Maritime Overseas?

A They had -- I don't think they called it that. They had a manual with instructions, and I don't know if it was -- no, it was called Master's Instruction. But it's an operating manual to tell you how they would like you to operate their vessel, yes.

Q And how about the oil companies that you worked under, did they distribute bridge manuals also?

A I -- they probably did. I don't remember specifically getting bridge manuals. I know we got all of their updates and all of their letters that they sent to their fleet. While we were under charter to them they would send those to them. They may well have sent out a bridge organization manual.

However, in our case, the company we're working for, their operation manual would be what we would -- would go by.

Q What is the purpose of having a bridge operation manual?

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Well, so that you will do things and operate the Α ship in a manner that the company expects you to.

0 Has your knowledge with -- has your work with all of these companies allowed you to acquire any special knowledge as to the maritime customs that have evolved in the safe operation and navigation of crude oil tankers?

A Well, I would say so, because we have worked for several different oil companies, and worked, you know, worked in the industry all that time, worked for all the major oil companies and got to see how each one of them did things, along with how my company as a transportation company did things.

Let's talk about the maritime industry a little bit, specifically the tanker industry. Generally, what type of crews did you have? What type of ship personnel were contained on a tanker that you were master of?

Well, you would have, of course, your master. you have your deck officers, and that consists of a chief officer who is the second in command of the vessel, and your right hand man as a master on a tanker. You have a second officer who normally does the detail work on upgrading your charts, keeping your charts corrected, your sailing directions, make sure the bridge and the bridge equipment and supplies in good order. And then your third officer, which is usually he's -- that's the junior member of the staff, and

other than his bridge duties he is normally left with the duties of taking care of and inventorying, inspecting fire fighting and safety equipment, things of that sort. And there's other details you give him. And that takes care of the deck officers.

You have a radio officer which is self explanatory.

He handles the vessel's radio traffic, does the electronic maintenance normally, and stands a radio watch for safety.

They are being done away with here I think now.

But then you have your engineers. Chief engineer which he is overall charge of the operation of the engine room. With a first assistant. The ships I was on normally had a first assistant, second assistant and third assistant. And they do various duties in the engine room as laid out by the chief engineer and help maintain and operate the plant and the ships equipment.

Your unlicensed departments would be your deck department, which is normally -- when I was sailing it consisted of nine men. You had six AB's and three ordinaries. They have now reduced that down on most of them to six AB's.

Your engine unlicensed would vary depending on the ship. You'd normally -- you have a pumpman. You normally have three -- on most of them they have three oilers, a pumpman and possibly a wiper as a cleanup man which some ships have done away with. Some don't -- that changes from ship to

ship.

R

And then you have your steward department that takes care of the cooking and quarter cleaning. And that could be anywhere from -- it used to be four or five men, and some of them three. Now I understand they are down to two.

Q Now, I'd like to talk a little bit about the people who work under you. Were you given a choice in who you got to choose as an able bodied seaman?

A No. The ships I was on was unionized. The company just called the union and they sent the people out. Now, I did have the choice when they came out of approval or disapproval of them. You had to have a good -- you know, naturally you had to have a good reason if you turned a man down and didn't take him. And I also had the right, if he didn't perform his job in a prescribed manner, that if I had a legitimate legal reason to dismiss him, I could dismiss him.

My officers, they come out of union, but a lot of them worked for the company. And there again, if they didn't perform like you wanted, you had the right to do something in that regard.

Q The able bodied seamen that worked under you, when the were at watch, what were their responsibilities?

## A Okay.

Normally at sea, their duties are steering the ship and lookout when they're on watch. During working hours, if

one man -- when you don't need a look out, you'll have one man standing the wheel watch the other man, would be doing some sort of maintenance around the vessel.

That's -- there are other duties besides at sea would be cargo watches in port. They do any valve turning, any line handling, any putting out your fire fighting equipment, taking off blanks, putting on blanks, looking for leaks, operating the equipment for crude oil washing if you're in a discharge port. Generally doing whatever the watch mate then tells him in order to operate the ship.

Q How does someone become qualified to get his AB license?

## A Okay.

Well, they start out as an ordinary seaman. Now, years back it was three years as ordinary to become an AB. Then it dropped to twelve months to get a limited AB ticket. And now I understand there's six months plus special training. I'm not just sure on the latest thing. But basically still, you can — twelve months I know you can as ordinary seaman and then you can go to the Coast Guard, take a test in which they cover various things that would expect an able seaman to do, and if he can pass that test and they give him a little written test along with practical knowledge, talking to him about tying knots, reading the compass, various things that he would need to know. And if he passes that test then they will

give him an able seaman endorsement.

\_

demonstrate skills in ship handling?

A In steering? No, what they would probably do is to maybe run through a routine of rudder commands and ask him what they would do, which is -- lets the inspector know that they have an idea about it. But there is no way that they can

In this test taking procedure, are they required to

Q Well, how does an able bodied seaman then acquire the ability to steer a vessel?

take them out and see if they could steer a ship.

A That's hands on experience learned on the ship.

Q How could you tell as a master whether someone was qualified to steer a vessel?

A Well, what you have to do is get in open water and put it in hand steering and let them steer and observe how they steer, give them a few course changes, see how they respond to that, how they do that. And then put it on — what I always tried to do was — with the new men when we left port is I would make them steer for their two hours of wheel watch and then review the course recorded, see if they do with the few minor course changes that we would give them. And if they did fine on that and had experience in the past on other vessels, and seemed okay, then that ended it.

If I wasn't satisfied with their steering, well then, they continued steering by hand for a trip maybe, or a

Q Is there a difference between someone who is qualified to steer, to be an able bodied seaman, and someone who you would have confidence in steering the vessel in say tight or closed waters?

A Oh, yes. What the Coast Guard would call qualified to steer is anyone who has passed an AB test. And what -- for steering in close quarter situations or in tight waters, you would want someone you had confidence in, either someone that had been on the ship with you in trips past that you knew could steer or someone who had already that trip proven that he was capable of steering.

Now occasionally it comes a time if you change all six AB's at one, then you are not sure of any of them, so you have to watch very closely the first trip until you, you know, decide which ones are good helmsmen, which ones aren't.

- Q Would the master, the captain, have the discretion to place an AB -- whatever AB at the helm that he wanted?
  - A Oh, yes.
  - Q Why would you do that?
- A Well, if you were unsure of a man, you would -- and you were in a tight situation, you would just tell that man, you know -- you'd change your watches around. You'd probably put him on lookout and the other AB on the wheel, or if necessary keep someone over from the previous watch to steer

until you got out into open water and then let the AB that you were uncertain of take over.

Q I would like to shift the focus here to have you explain the relationship between the master and the chief engineer on board. How -- what type of reporting duties does the chief engineer have to the master?

## A Okay.

5

7

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The chief engineer handles the maintenance and basically the running of the operation of the engine room. Now, the chief engineer is still a crew member under the master. But as the engine room and machineries become more important, his job has become more important. But part of his duties besides operating and running the engine room is to report fuel consumption to the master; he needs to report any requirements that he needs in the way of fuel, lube oils, what have you, so it can be ordered, maintained, you know, to maintain the vessel. He needs to report any problems with any of his engineers or personnel underneath him that he is aware of to the master. And every day he gives a noon slip with the engine room data that he has logged in the engine room in regards to miles on the engine slip, fuel consumed, so that the master can keep -- be kept aware of the operation of the engine room. And any damage to the engine room, any equipment failures, things like that, anything that would in the normal routine operation of the ship be something that was important

its contents?

/

Q With the coming of the importance of the machinery on board these tankers, does the master's responsibilities towards that, have they decreased towards the engine room and

A No, no. They have never decreased the master's responsibilities.

Q How important is a chief mate on board a tanker?

A Well, as I said, he is your right hand man in operation of the vessel. He's -- the chief mate stands a watch, depending on the ship -- normally I always had the chief mate on the 4:00 to 8:00 watch. The chief mate takes care of the hands on part of the cargo loading, the discharging, ballasting, any tank washing that you would have to do, the general maintenance of the vessel, the ordering of all the supplies and equipment used by the deck department, and he keeps -- let's see, I lost my train of thought. He keeps track of all the crew overtime in the deck department for review by the master and turning in.

And depending on the ship -- normally you don't give the chief mate any of the various voyage abstracts and reports, because he has got enough paperwork. But depending on your second and third mates, you may even have the chief mate doing some of that. So he is very important to the

Q What's abstracts?

A This is a form with various information that you need to turn in to the company and/or the charterer in order to determine how much oil -- you'll have an abstract with the loading information on how long it took you to load, what time you docked, undocked. Various times so that for billing and charging a company if you are chartered or in case it's a charter and there's a problem for -- it's a method to keep track of the oil, keep track of what the ship is doing, keep track of the various financial charges back and forth.

Q When you began sailing as a master on these tankers, how did they -- how did the loading process get accomplished? The loading of crude oil --

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I hesitate to object, but I think we're getting pretty far afield. I mean, we are talking now 1977, how a ship was loaded. I don't know what in the world relevance that has to anything here.

MR. COLE: I'll tie it in.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q How did the loading of a tanker occur at that time?
- A Oh, in -- you say when we started in Valdez? At that time the ships that I was on did not have inert gas.

  They were open, they loaded them the same as they had loaded

- Q What do you mean by open ullage caps?
- A Okay.

Well, that was a gauging cap that you could measure your oil through this open cap. At that point the mate on -- would be out on deck going from tank to tank checking and there was a tremendous amount of walking, a lot of -- because each tank had to be checked individually. Well, as they modernized the ships and went into a little -- got a little more modern and revamped them, they went into an automatic gauging system. They went to the inert gas systems that created -- that had a closed tank then where you didn't have to look at each tank. You used your automatic gauging systems. They had built in back up systems that you could check which was at each tank if you need it, and evolved to the fact that the chief mate was then usually in the cargo control office instead of out on deck running around.

Q Would it be fair to say that it has become fairly automated in some of the more advanced vessels?

A Yes, it has become more and more automated, and it's due to the ships getting bigger and the crews getting smaller, that is the only way that they could keep operating this, by trying to reduce the physical workload that was put on the mates loading.

•

*7* 

Q And as the captain, were you aware of the cargo loading and unloading process that occurred on the vessel that you happened to be --

A Oh, yeah; yes.

Q Did your responsibilities as to that lessen with the greater automation of this?

A No, no.

Q Would you tell the jury, Captain Beevers, what are the responsibilities of a tanker captain?

A Okay.

First, the master's in overall command of the vessel. He's in charge of the safety of his crew and vessel at all times. The master -- he has the responsibility of safe navigation. He has responsibilities of watching the pilot if you have a pilot on board. He has the responsibility of maintaining discipline on his ship if necessary. He has the -- despite the fact that in most of the companies that the companies pay their crew members direct now, he has the financial responsibility of seeing that they do get their monies legally. He has the -- he's the company's representative in all business matters pertaining to the ship. If you have to purchase stores or equipment, the master is the man that is responsible for the money for that, responsible for -- the responsible for all of the government papers, custom's forms, immigration, that you would have to file for

 sailing. He is responsible for the safety of the cargo on board. He is -- on and on and on. I --

Q Is he responsible for the command of the engine room?

A Overall, yes. The chief engineer makes his decisions. The chief engineer makes a mistake that is beyond what the captain would be aware of, then the chief engineer is going to have to accept some of the responsibility. But ultimately the master is responsible for the engine room also.

Q What about in emergencies? What are his responsibilities in emergencies?

A Okay.

The master there again is responsible for the safety of the crew, the safety of the vessel. He's responsible to -- it's his duty to be sure and -- in an emergency to notify anyone that he needs for assistance and aid. It is his responsibility to try to -- try to keep the damage to a minimum. Anything that happens in the operation of a vessel basically reverts back to the master.

Q Does he make decisions as to whether or not to, say for instance, abandon the vessel?

A That's in an emergency abandoning a vessel would certainly be something the master would make that decision.

In an emergency if you needed to call for salvage, that would be the master's decision. If you needed to get outside help -

•

.

Q Let's stop there. What do you mean by call for salvage?

A If you needed help in -- if you needed to get someone to get your vessel out of trouble, that would be up to the master to make the decision as calling for him.

Q Are there such things as salvage agreements in industry?

A Yes; yeah.

Q Would you tell the jury what a salvage agreement is?

A Well, it would be an agreement between a company that's trying to salvage a vessel and the vessel. And they have a -- the standard everyone that I think is aware of in the industry is Lloyd's Open Form, which is a -- basically it's a little more complex, but basically that is a no cure, no pay. You take the job with the idea that you will save the ship or you will not get paid.

Q If you do save the ship?

A You get a percentage of the value of what you have saved. And that is determined by a board of insurance people and salvage people.

The other way is by being hired on a cost plus basis or a contract basis. And that's -- it just depends on the situation which one that you would go. And that's another decision that -- those decisions normally in the actual

Q Would you describe for the jury, why are pilots required in certain parts of a ships travel?

3

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Yes. The -- various governments around the world, including the United States, have determined that for the safe operation of the vessels, it is prudent to have an experienced seafaring person with local knowledge and experience in the local area to assist ships coming in and out. And so they have set up -- each country has set up various rules for their pilots. What areas they need them in and what their training should be, what they need to know.

Q So the concept of pilotage in having a pilot aboard, that's not something that is unique to the United States?

A No, this is world wide and it has been in practice for many, many years. Years back, say in sailing ship times, it was normally an option -- an optional thing. Now most Federal and state laws and international -- various other country laws, they require them in certain areas.

Q Can you give the jury an idea of different parts of the world that require pilotage, where you sailed?

A Almost every place that I mentioned earlier that I have been to, there's -- other than Antarctica, there's no

•

pilotage down there. But most every -- every other port --

Q In Africa?

A They would have pilots there -- any place that I've been in Africa, they've had a pilot.

Q What's a pilot's responsibility once he comes on board?

A Okay.

The pilot will come aboard, discuss his -- his job and what he is going to do with the master, and his responsibilities are normally to assist the master in getting the vessel safely in port. And in practice what this means is that he normally takes the conn of the vessel and then he will maneuver the vessel, using his local knowledge and experience, into the port. But there again, always the pilot is under the -- under the -- he's working under the master. If the master decides this pilot is unfit, or this pilot is doing something drastically wrong, the master has the option of stepping in and taking the ship away from him.

Now I will say this. You need to -- you have to know it. It's not a light decision to make. You need to know where your vessel's at, you need to know when you take over what you're going to do then, because --

Q When you say, when you take over, you mean take over from the pilot?

A Yes. If you take over from the pilot and assume the

conn, you have to be very aware of the area that you're taking over in so that you don't take over and do something to damage your ship.

Q If the -- if you don't have a problem with the pilot, what are your responsibilities during the time the pilot is on board?

## A Okay.

The -- what normally happens, the responsibility is still the same. You're in charge of the vessel. But what normally happens is that when a pilot comes aboard is that if you are in a tight situation, or suppose you're docking or undocking or you are in a narrow channel, a master should be on board so that he can watch the pilot, watch his moves, and so that he can best -- after all, the master should still know his ship better than a pilot just coming aboard. He should be there to take over in case there is something major happens. He should be there in case the pilot makes a minor error to -- normally instead of taking over, you would just correct him or just mention it to him. And You have to be -- you have to be there to do this.

Now, once you're out in an area where it's not an immediate danger, the master can kind of step back and relax or -- it -- you can go down below for a minute, if you're not in an area where you're needed on the bridge.

Q Where have the pilots -- when you've been required -

- in areas where you have been required to have a pilot, where are the pilots during that time?

- A They're on the bridge conning the vessel.
- Q Have you ever had a situation where a pilot was not on the bridge conning the vessel where he was required?
  - A No.
- Q Where would -- you indicated that you had pilotage from Prince William Sound to Rocky Point?
  - A Yes.
- Q Where would you pick up and drop off the pilot on your trips inland and out?
- A We would pick up the State pilot just off of Rocky
  Point and proceed into the terminal. And then we would -outbound we would drop him off off from Rocky Point.
- Q What was your understanding of your responsibilities while in Prince William Sound without the pilot on board?
  - A From Rocky Point out?
  - O Yes.
  - A Okay.

At that point, I was normally the only person on the vessel with pilotage, and I assumed my responsibility was to be on the bridge piloting the vessel in and out.

- Q What about if you had to go to the, say, for instance the restroom during this time?
  - A There's usually facilities right on the bridge on

1 C 11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

22

23

24 25 most of the modern ships. It's just a matter of stepping into the -- stepping -- usually it's in the back of the bridge off the chart room, stepping into the bathroom facilities there and then right back within a few seconds or a minutes time.

Q What about messages that you had to send back to say, Valdez, or to other ports. How would you do that?

Α Well, that's --

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, unless it is clear that he is speaking only from his own knowledge and his own experience, and this in now way is probative of what was done on the Exxon Valdez, I guess I wouldn't object. But I think that should be made very clear.

THE COURT: I don't understand. Are you objecting or are you not objecting?

MR. MADSON: Well, it is not relevant, your Honor, unless it is made very clear that it's just from his prior experience. So I think with that in mind, I would object, because I don't know how to keep that separate. This is just his experience when he was there and in no way relates to what was done on March 23rd and March 24th last year.

THE COURT: Your objection as to relevance is overruled.

> (Resuming) BY MR. COLE:

How would you send -- what type of messages would Q have to be sent off during this period in and out?

A Okay.

Normally on your departure, when you leave the dock, you normally have to give your last line and gangway away to - information to the local agent, which is usually done VHF from the bridge. They have a portable radio. So that is taken care of right on the bridge.

You normally have a departure message which you send, usually after Hinchinbrook is where most people take departure.

- Q Where do you send that to?
- A Okay.

You would have a message to send to -- in my case, I would have a message to send to my company that I'd departed. I'd have a message to send at that time usually to the charterer, whichever oil company had the vessel chartered. And usually a message then to the terminal that you were proceeding to. And then --

- Q How would you send those messages?
- A You'd just -- I would write them out and give them to the radio operator and he would -- as when we had telex on, he would telex them off.
- Q Would you explain to the jury what "sailing coastwise" means?
- A That's from port -- you are sailing from a port in the United States to another port in the United States.

A Registry, that's a foreign trip. That doesn't have to be a foreign trip. You have to be ready to make a foreign trip. So you might leave Valdez under registry on your way to Panama and stop in Long Beach for fuel, crew changes, something of that sort.

(Start Tape C-3644)

And which time, I think you have to get in and out within twenty-four hours to do that. But it means that you are taking your cargo foreign if you are under registry, as a rule.

Q What determines if you are sailing coastwise or under registry?

A Where you're aboard your orders tell you to go. if you're going to Panama then you'd be under -- they have a dual certificate now, so it's no -- the change is not anything you do in a fact on the ship. It's a change in the way the agents -- what you turn in to the customs. Coastwise there's no customs involved, anything, but if you're going under -- going foreign, you have customs, you have the certified crew list to get, you have papers to file that way.

Q What do you mean by dual certificates?

A Well, years back you had your register was -- you were under enrollment if you were coastwise, so you had a big -- your certificate of registry set enrollment and it probably

mentioned coastwise then. If you went foreign, you had to go down to the Coast Guard and they would issue another registry that you had -- I forgot the wording, but you were under registry and something about sailing foreign.

Well, that was basically a waste of everyone's time changing each time, so they went to a dual registry which is the ship's register now says coastwise registry, I believe, is stated, and that is used as far as the ship is concerned for both. And like I say, what makes the difference is the port that you're taking your cargo to.

- Q If a vessel was traveling from -- a tanker from San Francisco to Valdez and back to Long Beach, would you be traveling coastwise or under the registry?
  - A You're coastwise.
- Q And upon reaching Cape Hinchinbrook, if you had pilotage endorsement to navigate that vessel between Cape Hinchinbrook and Rocky Point, would you be a pilotage vessel or a nonpilotage vessel?
  - A Repeat that please?
- Q If you were engaged in the San Francisco to Valdez and then back to Long Beach, upon reaching Cape Hinchinbrook, if you had pilotage endorsement to navigate the vessel between Cape Hinchinbrook and Rocky Point, would you be a pilotage vessel or a nonpilotage vessel?
  - A It would be a vessel that required pilotage.

Q Where would you be allowed to proceed to under your Federal --

A Under my license I would be allowed to go as far as Rocky Point.

MR. COLE: Judge, do you want to take a break? This is a break. It doesn't make any difference, we can go forward.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll take a ten or fifteen minute break, ladies and gentlemen. Remember my instructions not to discuss the matter among yourselves. Not to form or express any opinions and please pay particular attention to my cautions about media information. Avoid any media information concerning anything concerning the oil spill. Screen it, walk away from it, anything that gets you away from it.

We stand in recess.

THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands in recess subject to call.

(The Court stood in recess from 10:11 o'clock a.m. until 10:30 o'clock a.m.)

THE CLERK: The Court now resumes its session.

THE COURT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Thank you, your Honor.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Captain Beevers, before we begin, would you tell the jury, how often have you been called to testify in the past as

A The -- how many times?

Q Yeah. Have you been -- how many times have you been -- what have you done since you retired?

A Okay.

I have done a small amount of consulting, I've done my other business, and kind of relaxed and enjoyed myself. In the past I have testified on matters for Maritime Overseas, matters for Central Gulf Lines involving operations of the ship and various customs duties that came forth on a couple of those cases. And testified for -- in cargo cases when I worked for Maritime Over -- or United Maritime over events that happened during that. I testified about that later on.

Q When you say testified, do you mean gave depositions?

A No. Well, I have given depositions on personal injuries, things of that sort. This -- the one I just mentioned is a court case in New York involving sharing of -- average sharing on a machinery failure in doing a voyage.

Q Did you visit the Exxon Valdez at any point?

A Yes. Within a few days after it had grounded and while it was still on Bligh Reef lightering off, I went out with a team sent out by the -- by your office to look for various documents, papers, get -- inspect what we could inspect as far as bridge equipment, things of that sort.

Q Did you make any other trips out to Exxon Valdez?

A I believe all together I made three trips to the Valdez. I made two fairly early on when it was still on Bligh Reef. I made one trip later on after it had been moved around and anchored and then was preparing -- just before it left, when it was preparing to leave.

Q And during that time did you get a chance to walk around the bridge and observe the equipment that was on --

A Oh, yes. That was part of what we went out to check originally.

Q What material have you reviewed prior to coming in and testifying in this case?

A Well, I believe I have looked at everything that we picked up on the vessel during my two trips out there. I have reviewed the statements that were taken by the Coast Guard and by the FBI and by whoever — the State Troopers. I have reviewed all the statements that they took. I reviewed the grand jury material, all the exhibits, all the statements there. And documents — just about everything that has been — come in, I think, I have reviewed it. And also the Courtroom testimony of Mr. Cousins and Mr. Kunkel.

- Q And did you review the NTSB material?
- A NTS -- yes, NTSB material, I reviewed all of that.
- Q Do you know how many pages of material that comes to?

A Quite a bit. I have got a big box that's approximately this long full of notebooks with the material in it. So that's -- I wouldn't have an -- you know, as far as pages, I couldn't hazard a guess even, but it is considerable.

Q With this information in mind that has been provided, have you -- has it enabled you to reach any opinions concerning the conduct or actions taken by the master of the Exxon Valdez on March 23rd and March 24th of last year?

A Yes.

Q I'd like to begin with the captain returning to the vessel on the evening of the 23rd. Do you have any opinion about that activity and whether or not that constitutes bad judgment?

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I will to that. We're asking to have one witness evaluate somebody else, and in his opinion whether it's good judgment or bad judgment. That's an issue the jury has to decide in relationship to the instructions the Court gives in a case, not personal opinions.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not -- we're not going to get to that yet. The question is, do you have any opinion. The form of the question is so broad, Mr. Cole, I am going to require you, if you are going to ask this witness opinion questions, to be very narrow and specific with them so they will give some assistance to the jury here if they get admitted.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

25

(Pause.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 0 Do you have an opinion as to the captain's judgment in returning late to the vessel? Α Yes. 0 What is that opinion? MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I object again. I think 7 judgment is not an issue here. 8 MR. COLE: Judge, can we approach the Bench? THE COURT: Yes. 10 (An off the record Bench conference was had.) 11 THE COURT: Okay. At this time the objection as to 12 the form of the question will be sustained under evidence rule 13 705. Mr. Cole will have to lay a better foundation. 14 BY MR. COLE: (Resuming) 15 Captain Beevers, what information specifically did you review concerning the time period from what the captain 17 was doing between 7:30 on March 23rd and 8:30, when he came 18 aboard? 19 Α That's 8:30 p.m.? 20 8:30 p.m. Q A 21 Okay. 22 Is that 7:30 p.m.? THE COURT: (Resuming) 23 BY MR. COLE: 7:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. on March 23rd, 1989. 24 Q 25 Α Okay.

12

19

21

24

25

Let's see, I read the interview with the taxi driver, Mr. French. I read Patricia Caples' interview. read the statement by -- her statement. I read the chief mate's statement, Mr. Kunkel. I read Mr. Cousins' statement

- Did you read statements by Mr. Glowacki?
- Yeah, I read the chief engineer's statements, the radio officer's statement, and --
- Did you see any information, deck security logs that would have indicated when the --
- Yeah, correct. The Alyeska logs for the -- at the guard -- at the gate by the guards. That was part of the documents and statements and literature that I read.
- Did you read any of the deck logs that would have told you when the vessel was ---
  - -- reviewed the deck log for that day, the --
- And based upon all this evidence, have you reached any opinions as to the conduct of the master, Joseph Hazelwood, between 7:30 and 8:30 p.m. on March 23rd, 1989?
- Would you tell the jury what that opinion is? Q MR. MADSON: I still raise my same objection, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question?

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Would you tell the jury what that opinion is?

A Well, my opinion is from all the documents that I read is he was uptown with the radio officer, chief engineer, and they had been drinking and had stopped by to pick up a pizza and had another drink. They had gotten a taxi, came back to the ship. And my opinion of what all this led to is that he should have been on the vessel earlier. He came back late. All the cargo was done, the vessel was ready to sail. And basically they were waiting to get the paperwork done, get the boom away and sail.

And by being late, the bad judgment in coming back late comes in in the fact that this reduced the captain's time to review the ice report, whether such things as that, and this may have eliminated one of his options in the fact that if the ice report would have indicated ice was very bad, he could have made a decision at that time to remain at the dock until he could arrange undocking in order to have a daylight transit through the area of ice. This is one option that was open to the master that evening in making his decision on what to do.

- Q Have you ever stayed overnight?
- A No, I haven't. However, I brought a ship in at one

time, the Overseas Boston, and -- which relieved to go on vacation in Valdez, and my relief -- the ship was scheduled to sail at night. My relief didn't sail, he waited until he could make a daylight transit through the ice.

- Q Now, have you reviewed information concerning the vessel's travel approximately a half an hour after docking until the vessel reached Potato Point?
  - A Yes. There again --
  - Q What evidence have you reviewed on that?
- A Captain Murphy's statement, Mr. Cousins' statement, the -- I can't recall the AB -- the statement from the wheelsman at that time, Radtke, I believe, or Claire. And I believe that is all that had any -- that's all I can think of now that had any direct relationship to that period you are mentioning.
- Q And have you reached any opinions on Captain

  Hazelwood's failure to be on the bridge during the transit

  through the narrows?
- MR. MADSON: I'm going to object; it's a leading question.
- THE COURT: Can you rephrase your question, Mr. Cole?
  - BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)
- Q What is your opinion on Captain Hazelwood's failure to remain on the bridge through the transit through the

Narrows?

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I will object on the grounds of relevancy. The transit through the Narrows had absolutely nothing to do with what occurred afterwards.

THE COURT: Objection overruled. Relevancy objection is overruled.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q What is your --

A Okay.

Once they undocked and left, left the dock to go out, at the point between the dock and turning to enter the Narrows is a fairly safe area. If Captain Hazelwood would have needed to go below for a minute at that time, that would be well within the normal operations of a vessel, because the pilot after all is conning, the pilot is -- knows the area very well. The mate, I believe the chief mate was up there when he undocked. So this would be all right.

But he should have been back on the bridge as they turned to enter the Narrows, should have remained on the bridge through the Narrows to watch for any errors in pilot command, any errors in following the pilot's order by the quartermaster, any errors in the third mate in handling the engine bridge control lever for speed, and should have been there in case of a -- any emergency, any unforseen emergency that came up so that -- because that area through the Narrows

is very, very -- it's a close quarters area, very tight, and it's an area that the master should be there in order to respond immediately to a problem.

Q Did you ever leave the bridge while you were traveling through the Narrows?

A No.

MR. MADSON: I would object, your Honor, on the grounds of relevancy. What he did or did not do as a personal preference is totally immaterial.

THE COURT: The answer came in before Mr. Madson was able to make an objection. Do you wish to be heard on the objection?

MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.

One of the elements that I have to prove, the State has to prove in this case is that Captain Hazelwood acted -- was aware of and consciously disregarded a substantial and unjustifiable risk. In addition to that, the risk must of such a nature that it would constitute a gross deviation from the standard of care that another person would exercise -- reasonable person would exercise under similar circumstances.

One of the ways of proving that is to show what other people do in that particular situation. I think that his personal choice, given his experience in the trade, is exactly on point.

THE COURT: Objection overruled, Mr. Madson.

5

7

8

10

11

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23

25

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, if I may, what this is going to do is open the door for how many people to come in here and disagree or agree, and maybe we can take a majority vote. That's my position; I think it's irrelevant.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled, Mr. Madson.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q What was your standard procedure going through the Narrows? As master?

A Okay.

We would always have, you know, your complement up there would be a watch officer and a helmsman. The pilot would be on the bridge with the conn. I would be on the bridge to observe and to be ready to take care of any problems that comes up. And one of the big problems is the fact that with more and more foreign ships and less American ships in the trade, the pilots are all used to giving commands to foreign ships is starboard 10 degrees rudder, where American ships, it's left and right instead of port and starboard. even the good pilots make errors all the time. This is a simple little thing you would think the helmsman would understand, but it's something that might cause a delay in the helmsman's response before it is realized by the pilot or the helmsman what he means. So that's just one little item that you catch quite frequently. The possibilities for an error in setting the speed due to the fact that the vessel is required

5

7

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- pilot vessels in from Hinchinbrook using your Federal pilotage endorsement, with other captains, through the Narrows?
- Any ship that I was on, the captain stayed on the bridge going through the Narrows.
- Now, I'd like to focus on the period after the pilot Q -- after the vessel exited the Narrows to when the pilot got off. What information have you reviewed on that?
- Basically the same, for the statements of Captain Murphy, the statements of Mr. Cousins, the statements of the helmsman at the time, the deck log book, bell book.
- Did you take the statements of the -- did you review the statements of the watch -- the lookout that evening?
- Yes, whoever was on watch, the lookout, AB, the helmsman, everyone concerned with the navigation of the ship at that time.
- And did you review the bell logger and course recorder during that time?

1.1

Q Do you have any opinions as to what occurred during that time?

A Well, it was a routine passage out at that time, and this is up to when Murphy got off between -- was a routine passage, seemed to follow the optimum track line. Everything went normal. And Captain -- the original statements indicated that the captain did not return until just before Captain Murphy got off.

And there was a problem with him coming up to the bridge on time. There again, this is a — there's nothing — he has enough area there for the master to leave the bridge if he needs to go below for something. But there's certain times you should be on the bridge, and when the pilot is leaving certainly the master should be up there in time to review where the vessel is at, the speed the vessel is making, get his eyes adjusted to the night vision, get all the information the pilot has to leave him — leave with him. And again, get an ice report or determine what he is going to do from the time he relieves the State pilot until he gets to sea.

- Q Now, I'd like to focus on the period of time from when the pilot disembarked from the Exxon Valdez that evening until Captain Hazelwood left the bridge that evening.
  - A Okay.
  - Q What information have you reviewed in that regard?

A Okay.

I have reviewed the deck log book, the bell book, the course recorder, I have reviewed Mr. Cousins' statements, I reviewed the statements of Mr. Claire, Mr. Radtke, Maureen Jones and Mr. Kagan.

- Q And do you have -- before I ask you about your opinion, at that point in a journey out of Prince William Sound, what is the normal or routine practice or custom that is employed after the master is dropped off?
  - A The pilot.
  - Q The pilot.

A Normal routine under a normal situation would be for the vessel to disembark the pilot, stow the pilot equipment away, go ahead and proceed out the outbound lanes. Normally at that time a vessel would start increasing to sea speed. Have the lookout come up to the wing of the bridge. Then the master or whoever has the pilotage piloting the vessel out just report in to when abeam of Rocky Point that you report into the VTC advising him of your speed and estimated time of being abeam of Naked Island. And proceed out uneventfully out the traffic lanes.

(Pause.)

- Q And there is a parter right here. Would you use that pointer to show about in what area that occurs generally?
  - A Okay.

- Q What would be -- in a normal or routine transit, what would be the speed that you would use? How fast?
- A At this point in a normal transit I would increase to sea speed, which on most vessels is close to 16 knots on most tankers. That seems to be the overall average. And at this point you would normally put your lookout on the wing of the bridge. You would normally have your sailors -- hopefully they would be finished securing everything. You would have your last check to make sure the vessel was seaworthy so that you were ready to proceed to sea.
- Q In your evaluation or reading of the material and the testimony, was this a normal or routine transit that you would have employed these types of procedures?
  - A No.

2

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q Why is that?
- A Because of the report from the VTC in regards to ice in the area of Columbia Bay between Point Freemantle and

Glacier Island.

Q Did it make a difference that this was being done at night?

- A Yes.
- Q Why is that?

A Well, naturally in the daytime you are going to have better visibility and you will be able to see the ice better and be able to see your land better. At night you have to depend on being able to see your navigation lights that's placed in various areas around and use your radar for land. In the daytime you would have the option of being able to use visual bearings off from light houses or tangents off from islands, things of that sort.

- Q Have you seen the drawings that Mr. Cousins made of what the ice looked like on that evening?
  - A Now that I haven't seen, no. That's --
- Q Now if Mr. Cousins indicated in his testimony to the jury that this area surrounded by the green line was an indication of the icing conditions that he saw that evening on the radar that went from Point Freemantle all the way over to Bligh Reef --
- A Okay, now, what is this -- how did he -- I mean, this is a general area here that I -- but what is --
- Q And if he indicated that that was the gap between the leading edge of the ice and Bligh Reef, that line, would

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

you consider that to be a fairly large amount of ice that would constitute a danger to the vessel of your ship?

Α That would depend on the size of the ice and how thick. Depending on how large a piece, individual pieces are, how many pieces are there, how far apart they are, but normally if you are not sure, you would regard ice as a If you couldn't determine it wasn't, to be on the safe side, you would -- you always want to err on the side of safety when you are dealing with a problem such as this.

Well, what would be, if a master were looking at Q that -- that type of image through this radar, say six miles before it, what would be his options at that point?

At that point the -- at six miles you're back up in here someplace. At that point it is going to be pretty hard to tell how much ice is there, whether it's a few scattered pieces, whether it is large pieces, small pieces --

Q Why is it hard to tell from that distance?

Well, the -- with radar you have a situation of Α range resolution and bearing resolution which tends to make targets look bigger. The further away they are from you the bigger the target will look in comparison to its actual size. So it would give you a false indication that the ice is -there's more ice or there's -- the ice is bigger than it really is, there is more ice in the area than it really is.

And one option he would have would be to continue on

down the lanes at maneuvering speed -- reduce the speed so he has got time to look the situation over, determine at that time if the ice is really thick enough to divert around --

- Q You said get close enough to determine what the ice really looks like. What do you mean by that?
  - A Be within a couple of miles of the edge of the ice.
  - Q How would that help you?
- A Well, at that point, as the targets get -- you could turn your radar down to a -- to a -- to a smaller scale.

  Instead of a twelve mile scale, say you could be down on a three mile scale at this point. And that would give you a better picture. You're closer to the target so there's lesser distortion of the size due to the resolution and range bearing.

And at that point, you might find that the picture looks considerably different than it does from back here on a six mile scale or twelve mile scale or whatever you have to be on that far back.

Q When you were transiting out of Prince William
Sound, did you ever encounter ice -- for lack of a better word
-- images on your radar that were -- that looked like that
from a far distance away?

A Yeah, I have seen ice -- I've seen ice all the way over, I have seen it over and disappearing on down into here.

But also what you find, what I found is on an incoming tide it

10 11

12

14 15

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

is not uncommon to have the ice up in here held in for some way, ice down along Glacier Island and ice on over from the separation zone over and pushed up in here and actually have the ice scattered enough that there's -- that I have come down the outbound lane with ice on both sides and have the lane actually basically free.

When you did that, what speeds would you travel?

At that time, since you're near ice, I tried to go four to six knots, depending on the amount of ice. is so that if you need to, you can -- you have time to see the ice and do -- and maneuver to avoid it.

There has been testimony that this tanker maneuvers better at higher speeds.

Α No. You lose your -- you have a faster turning. you put the vessel hard over, it'll -- at full speed, you'll have a quicker response in turning. It's still -- I believe this vessel it's nearly six-tenths of a mile before you are turned to a 90 degree angle away from your course. But the thing, you don't have the time. When you are maneuvering at slower speeds, you have the time to observe an object. When you start making your course change, even though the vessel moves slower, what you do to speed that up then, since you are at four knots and on dead slow ahead or stop to be at four knots, you can kick your engine to half ahead and that will turn you at a much faster rate than --

. .

Q How do you use your rudder in that situation?

A Maneuvering that slow, any time you use your rudder, it has got to be a hard right or hard left to start a turn, and then ease off and check it when you want to start back up.

When you give it a -- when you attempt to make a maneuver and you give it a boost as you say, put it to half ahead, when do you do that in the part of your turn?

A As you're -- as you're starting your turn, you would put your rudder -- if you wanted to turn to the right, you would put your rudder hard right, kick it half ahead for a few seconds and stop it, and you'd see the vessel swing. And then it is a matter of checking it up and if you have to use more engine to assist in checking it, that's fine. Normally I found that I didn't have to use the engine on checking it because you have -- where you have a lot of sea room and it doesn't matter if you check it up immediately on an exact course at that time, it is a matter of getting it -- the swing stopped and getting it headed on outbound out the lanes.

Q Where would you put your watch -- who would you use as watch in those situations?

## A Okay.

On the -- in the -- if it's a daytime passage, I'd just get myself, the watch mate and the helmsman. At night, I'd have the lookout -- weather permitting now. A lookout on the bow, and if we were maneuvering through ice, if there's

enough ice to maneuver through I would send the chief mate up to the bow with a radio.

Q Why would you do that? Why do you want these two people up at the bow?

A The lookout is required by law, and the lookout is fine for normal sightings -- lights, fishing vessels, ice in the distance is fine -- but when you're -- in this maneuver you're perhaps going to be close to what the smaller ice pieces, bergy bits or growlers, and I want a man with the most experience I can get to be up there to advise me of anything that I -- you know, he after all is going to be 800 foot closer, so seven or eight hundred foot closer to the ice than I am. And the chief mate would be the logical man to send up there due to his experience.

Q Would you tell the jury how it is that you -- how does the ice -- how does the ship avoid the ice in these type -- using this type of maneuvering?

## A Okay.

Using this what helps you avoid the ice, there is -first off, of course, you are looking for the larger pieces of
ice and staying away from them. The what they call brash ice
is the small pieces and small ice, that's of no consequence.
Such things as what's called a growler, which would be a chunk
of ice, three, four, five footer, crossed, that is, floating,
these would be a problem if you hit them at full sea speed.

There's no doubt about it. But at slow speeds, what you do is you maneuver away from them. And remember, the bow of a vessel is -- of a tanker is a round object, and it is similar to this, say. And it pushes the water aside --

Q As it goes through it?

A As it goes forward. Instead of cutting through the water where the water is trying to run down the side from the bow, it just literally is like a bulldozer and it just pushes it out to the side and the water goes out. And this will --will automatically carry your ice towards the out -- outside of your bow wave. And between maneuvering away from the ice and this pushing it away, I have never had any problem with avoiding ice.

Now, the -- that's another way --

Q Well, let me just ask you that. Are there -- is there other ways to go around the ice?

A Yes. Another thing is to do -- come down and head over this way, as a lot of ships do. But the problem with that is that you reduce --

Q Before you go into the problems, how do you -- what is the other way?

A Okay.

You'd come down, keep it on maneuvering speed -- now

I would at that point -- keep it on maneuvering speed, change

course to steer down to the southbound lane. Now when you go

out of this lane you have to call the VTS system, the VTC.

You tell them what you are doing, you are diverting out of the lanes due to ice. Then you would make your diversion. If you go far enough to go out of the traffic lanes, you again are required to call and tell them that you are leaving the lanes.

All right. And then you would come on down around the ice. Now this is extending up reasonably close to Busby Island, reasonably -- very close to Bligh Reef. And to use this method of just skirting the ice, going around the ice, you have to keep one thing in mind -- you have to remember to have enough sea room.

- Q Why is that important?
- A So you don't run aground. That's -- if you are going to avoid the ice by going around the ice, you still -- you have to look out for the other dangers involved in that.
  - Q What are the advantages of going around the ice?
- A Well, the advantages there are that you don't have the maneuvering to do. You can operate your ship at a faster speed so you save time. You get on around the ice and on out and on your journey sooner.
  - Q And what are the disadvantages?
  - A The disadvantage of that is running aground.
- Q What are the advantages of maneuvering through the ice as you explained earlier?
  - A You have deep water here. You have more room. And

you can -- your ships's in a safer position.

- Q What are the disadvantages?
- A The disadvantages are that it takes more time. You are going at a slower speed, you are maneuvering around the ice. You may have to stop your vessel or stop the engine and go even slower than the four knots at times to do something. So it takes more time. It is more intense as you are doing this. It is a constant checking and maneuvering. And it's a disadvantage also is it uses more people. You've got your chief mate out there after -- after his working cargo and stuff all day, and it's harder on the personnel.
- Q Captain, who makes the decision on which option to do in that case?
  - A The master.

Now there's one other scenario that could happen and does occasionally, is that you make your change over here and then discover that you're too close to Busby Island or the ice is too close to Busby Island, or the ice goes all the way across. At that point then you have to start maneuvering your way back across through the ice.

- Q And have you done that before?
- A I -- I don't recall ever getting out of the lanes and having to maneuver back. I recall coming over to the southbound lane and having to maneuver back. Any time I -- I don't recall actually ever leaving the lanes. If I have left

the lanes it is because it has been open and I could go all the way out.

Q As a captain of a tanker faced with situations such as this, do you take special precautions to assure the safety of your vessel?

A Yes. Yeah, your special precautions in this case is the reduction of speed, the extra lookout, and instructions to the lookout what to look for and how to report it so that there's no confusion or no overlooking anything. The use of your -- special attention and use of your radars, especially using the three centimeter on a short range, so that you have as clear a picture as possible of what you're maneuvering with.

- Q Now, based on the review of the information that you cited earlier, do you have an opinion about the actions taken by Captain Hazelwood from the time the pilot got off of the Exxon Valdez that evening at about 11:24, until Captain Hazelwood left the bridge that evening at about 11:53?
  - A Yes.
- Q Would you tell the jury what those opinions are?

  MR. MADSON: Same objection as noted earlier, your

  Honor.

THE COURT: Relevance?

MR. MADSON: Yes. And 403 also, I might add.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. As they dropped the pilot off -

 $\|$ 

,

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Maybe I can use the other one and you can use the two of them in tandem.

A Oh, okay.

As they dropped the pilot off -- I don't have my glasses on, but back in here some place -- the vessel called Vessel Traffic Control and advised them at that time that they had dropped the pilot off and immediately was asked for an ice report after passing through, and at that point the vessel stated it was altering course to port -- to avoid the ice. So already back at this point the decision was made -- on this one, back at this point the decision was made to divert around the ice. And I don't feel at that point they really had a clear picture of what they had in the lanes.

Now the ice report that was issued four hours earlier by the outbound vessel said scattered small pieces of ice. It didn't say a solid field, it didn't say large boogie bits, ice bergs, anything. It said scattered small pieces of ice. So they probably should have came -- I feel that they certainly should have -- due to the lapse in time, four hours later and the fact it's an incoming tide, they should have came a little closer and took a better look.

And instead they went around across, took a fix here

-- as you can see 39 here -- they took a fix as they crossed the separation zone which is fine, that's what they should do, is change course to 200. It's coming on down and then he changes course somewhere down here to 180. And at this time they are on maneuvering speed despite I believe they mentioned increasing to sea speed, but they never did. They remained on maneuvering speed.

At this point right here the vessel was obligated to call the Vessel Traffic Center and advise them that they were leaving the traffic lanes. And --

Q What speed was the vessel traveling shortly -- let's say 11:35, after the pilot -- after the pilot had been dropped off?

A By 11:35 they should have been back up ten and a half knots, maybe eleven. It depends on the turns. Of course, any time you make a turn, you slow the speed down. But I would say they were probably between ten and eleven knots at that time.

Q Now, what about the placement of the vessel on automatic pilot after coming to a heading of 180 degrees?

A Okay.

They came around to 180 and put the ship on autopilot. And they are in an area here that should really be kept on hand steering.

Q Why is that?

A Well, you're close to -- you're on a 180 course, which as you can -- is putting you down behind Bligh Reef.

You've got Busby Island ahead that you're going to pass approximately one mile off. You've got ice out here in front of you that you've either -- you've either got to maneuver through or go around, depending on the circumstances as you get closer.

At that point, if you put the engine on sea speed at that time and start -- or if you put the thing in autopilot, you do not -- you then have to tell someone to change to hand steering and -- in order to make a course change, whereas if you are already on hand steering, you've got the instant response of the helmsman.

Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not Captain Hazelwood exercised good judgment in placing that vessel on autopilot there?

MR. MADSON: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Relevance?

MR. MADSON: And 403. But his opinion as to what someone else should do or not do when there is no legal requirement that he has to do one or the other is totally irrelevant.

THE COURT: Objection overruled.

Move the microphone up a little further; it is being blocked by your arm.

THE WITNESS: Oh, sure.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Do you have an opinion on whether or not Captain Hazelwood exercised good or bad judgment when he placed the Exxon Valdez on autopilot on that course heading?

- A That is in my opinion bad judgment.
- Q Why?

A Just for those -- for that reason. You don't have a man -- your helmsman is no longer steering. You have got him standing there, and it's the possibility of a delay in changing back to hand steering, a delay in the response if you need a course change.

Q What about -- do you have an opinion as to leaving the lookout -- or placing the lookout on the bridge wing?

A With ice ahead, I would think that's a bad decision also. Now, there was no indication of high winds or bad weather. Normally, the reason you move the lookout from the bow up to the bridge wing coming out of Prince William Sound is because of high winds and choppy seas, something that might be a danger to having a lookout up forward. This evening there were, I think, force two winds, something, very light winds and winds — a breeze of that nature is not going to cause high enough seas to have spray coming over the deck or seas or anything. There is no weather reason to do that.

And the reasons to leave him up there is because of

the close proximity to Bligh Reef buoy, Busby Island and the ice. Traditionally a lookout is to be placed as low as possible and as far forward, to -- you know, so that he can safely be placed there. That is traditionally the bast place for a lookout.

- Q Can you give the jury an idea of where this vessel was at approximately 11:52? Just approximately.
- A Okay. At 2352 they should have been somewhere right in here, just slightly north of Busby Island, and approximately a little over a mile off of Busby Island at that point.
- Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not in gauging the load program up at this point, at 11:52, was evidence of good or bad judgment by Captain Hazelwood on March 23rd?
- A That again is bad judgment because you are increasing the vessel's speed going into these dangers ahead of you. You're reducing the time that you have to make a maneuver. You're reducing the options of making a maneuver eventually.
- Q Would you give the jury an idea of at ten knots, let's say, how fast -- how much -- how long does it take for a vessel to go one mile?

A Okay.

If you're going ten knots, it would six minutes.

Q And how far would the vessel travel in one minute?

A Just under two-tenths of a mile. I'd have to get my calculator out here, but right at two-tenths of a mile.

Q How far ahead of you from where you are when you're on the bridge is the actual bow of the vessel?

A Well, on the Exxon Valdez it was somewhere in the neighborhood of eight hundred foot, I imagine, seven hundred, eight hundred foot. I never actually measured it.

Q And as a master of a ship, would you anticipate taking into consideration the rate that the vessel is traveling per minute, the amount of time, and how far up ahead of you the vessel was when you actually took fixes?

A Oh, yes, you have to -- you have to consider that.

Especially -- that's not so important out in open waters, but in close quarters situations that's very important.

Q Captain Greiner -- I'm sorry. Captain Beevers, can you tell us when you're in a situation like this, like was confronting Captain Hazelwood in this case, would you -- do you have an opinion as to what type of fixes should be made during this time?

A Well, you certainly should make -- have the watch officer taking and plotting frequent fixes to determine that your vessel is truly doing what you are wanting it to do in maneuvering. And by frequent, I would say ten minutes apart. It doesn't have to be exactly that, but that is frequent to

me. Twenty minutes is not frequent in that situation.

- Q How important is it in a situation like this to have qualified personnel up on the bridge with you?
- A Well, there again, it is very important, because you want your helmsman to be a good helmsman, you want your watch mate to be competent, capable and efficient, and you want a lookout that is conscientious that's going to report everything as soon as possible that they see.
- Q Do you have an opinion on whether or not Captain
  Hazelwood should have left the bridge at 11:53 on March 23rd,
  1989?
  - A He shouldn't have left the bridge, no.
  - Q Why is that?

1:

MR. MADSON: For the record I make the same objection, your Honor. It's a little late, I realize, but I am anticipating the Court's same ruling. So just for the record, I want to object.

THE COURT: You did wait too long, but I would have ruled the same way.

THE WITNESS: Yes. He had his ship heading into a dangerous situation, a situation that needed someone with experience to maneuver it. A situation that was beyond what you would expect an inexperienced -- relatively inexperienced third mate to be able to do on his own.

Q Let's start with that. Why do you consider Mr.

1.5

A Well, he -- he -- I believe he only had like thirteen months sea time, something like that, on his license. Very little sea time. And during that time most of it was spent on the West Coast tanker trade, in which there is very little actual ship handling and maneuvering done by a watch officer in any -- there is no close quarters that they should be maneuvering in. So it would be highly unlikely that he would be experienced at doing anything other than making a small course change out in the open waters at sea, with an occasional maneuvering situation in open sea. But he shouldn't be -- certainly shouldn't be expected after thirteen months to be proficient in handling a tanker of that size in restricted waters.

Q What about, do you have an opinion on Mr. Kagan being at the helm?

A Yes, I do. If this man -- this man apparently had problems steering vessels before. Apparently had problems following simple orders, and I think the proper thing to do in that case is when he come up on watch, send him out on lookout and have the other AB take the first wheel watch. After their first wheel watch, if they'd of made it around the reef, they'd of been down here in open water. Would have been much more prudent to put someone that you had confidence in on the wheel than to put a man that you knew had had problems

Q Do you have an opinion on the type of instructions as to whether or not Captain Hazelwood exercised good or bad judgment concerning the instructions that he left Mr. Cousins with that evening before going below?

A Well, I consider it bad judgment because he shouldn't have left. That's the -- he didn't -- the instructions he give him -- normally when you leave a watch mate on the bridge in a situation like that you have a track lane laid out with specific points to make your course changes, specific courses to steer, specific instructions as to when to call the master if you need the master and on like that. In this particular case, it was kind of a vague, come right at Busby Island and go to this point and do this and -- but they couldn't lay a definite track line out because they had ice up ahead that they weren't sure how they were going to get through or around.

Q Would that -- would that require, under the hypothetical, if you were to leave, going to the chart and actually drawing, physically drawing --

A Oh, yeah. You draw your track line out on a chart so that you -- there's no misunderstanding as to what you want, when you want it done, and what actions the third mate should take.

Q Do you consider just pointing at a radar and giving

21

22

23

24

25

the order, when you get abeam of Busby Island, come right and join up with the Vessel Traffic System, an adequate instruction?

- A Not in this circumstance, no.
- Q What about Captain Hazelwood's questioning of Mr. Cousins to determine whether or not he was comfortable?

A Okay.

When I read that, I noticed that he asked Mr.

Cousins twice, are you comfortable with these instructions, are you com — this indicates to me that either Captain

Hazelwood wasn't comfortable with leaving Cousins there by himself, or conversely if he felt that Cousins wasn't capable of doing it, he shouldn't have left. Either way you look at it there was a little hesitancy there that he should not have, as long as there is any doubt you shouldn't leave the bridge.

Q Do you have an opinion on whether or not Captain Hazelwood exercised good or bad judgment for leaving the bridge for the length of time that he did.

MR. MADSON: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled. And that objection is relevancy and 403, as I understand it.

MR. MADSON: Correct.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: In my opinion, it was bad judgment to leave the bridge period in that particular location at that

time, whether for one minute or for twenty minutes. It was bad judgment.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q Now, have you reviewed information concerning what occurred from the time Captain Hazelwood left the bridge until the time of the grounding?
  - A Yes, I have.
  - Q What information have you reviewed on that point?
  - A Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

25

I read Kagan's statements, I read Cousins' statement, I reviewed the course recorder, bell logger, and --

Q Okay.

And have you reached any opinions on Captain

Hazelwood's good or bad judgment in not coming back to the

bridge during that time?

A Well, the -- seems to me he left the bridge just before they were abeam of Busby Island, apparently with verbal instructions for Cousins to make a course change at Busby Island. And when Cousins actually called him, it was several minutes after the expected course change and Cousins said at that point I am coming -- I have put ten degrees right rudder on, or I'm coming right, or making the turn. Made some indication that the turn was being made. I would think that Captain Hazelwood would have realized that it's too late at

5

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this point, that he's way late on his turn and been back up on the bridge almost immediately.

Q What information that was passed to Captain Hazelwood at that time would indicate that there might be some problems up ahead?

## Α Okay.

The fact that he is -- his phone call -- how did he put that. That he put ten degrees rudder on and the vessel seemed to be not responding. I have forgotten the exact phone conver -- the statement on exactly what they said, but there was a question on the turn wasn't being made.

What about the information that they might still be encountering -- coming encounter with the ice.

## Α Okay.

That was in the phone, too, at that time. we may get into the edge of the ice, which indicates to me that they would probably have to start maneuvering in ice. Because getting into the edge of the ice doesn't mean to me that you are going around the edge of the ice, that means you are getting into the ice.

- And do you have an opinion as to what Captain Hazelwood should have done at that point?
  - Should have immediately returned to the bridge. A
- Now, have you looked at the course recorder that was taken off the Exxon Valdez that evening?

A Yes, I have.

Q And have you reviewed it to determine whether or not any turns were made -- when a ship course heading was made on the Exxon Valdez during the time period around midnight?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

Now, I would like you to take the pointer and point to the time when the vessel steadied up on a course of 180.

A Okay.

Right here is where they made their course. Here's where they steadied up, and from here on they're on 180. This little bip here is stopping the turn and probably -- and maybe overturning it. At this point they are on 180.

- Q And would that be at about 11:50 that evening?
- A It looks like around 11:50 roughly when they are squared away on it.
- Q Based on your -- have you looked at course recorders in the past?
  - A Yes.
- Q Based on your experience, when did the Exxon Valdez begin to make a heading change away from 180 degrees on the night of March 23rd, March 24th, 1989?
  - A Right up here at this point.
  - Q And what time approximately would that be?
  - A That's -- I determined that at two minutes after,

which is -- you know, it's kind of hard as small as this is, but I -- interpolating between these, I figured two minutes after, they started making a course change.

- Q How long would it take for a vessel of this type to change heading after a rudder command of, say, ten degrees right rudder was given and executed?
- A You should within twenty seconds, if you are really watching close, you should see a change in your heading. You would probably see your rate of turn indicator show a rate of turn before your gyro actually did. And within thirty seconds you should definitely see it moving. Within a minute you should have approximately ten degrees heading change.
- Q Would this course heading change be reflected on the course recorder?
  - A Yes, it would.
- Q And let me ask you another question. Assuming that someone gave an order of ten degrees right rudder, but the execution of it only resulted in a rudder angle of six to seven degrees, would you expect -- how long would you expect it before the vessel changed headings?
- A Probably just a few seconds more than the twenty.

  Probably thirty seconds you would start moving and within a minute you would see a few degrees change. I haven't figured out that, but within a minute, they should be a heading change that is noticeable.

autopilot, and when the helm was ordered ten degrees right,

there was no response because it was on autopilot. That would

1

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be one reason. The second reason is that no rudder command

opinion.

THE WITNESS: Well, Captain Hazelwood is an experienced master that has had several years experience maneuvering vessels and would have been more likely to realize that the response wasn't occurring when it should have. In other words, if he's of ordered ten degrees right rudder, within thirty second to a minute he would have been more likely to realize that the vessel wasn't responding than Mr. Cousins who's got very limited experience.

Also, the -- Captain Hazelwood would have probably set his priorities differently if he'd of been there. He would have been more interested in the heading change of the vessel than all of the other running around that was being done by Mr. Cousins, trying to get his fix, get his fix plot, talk to the lookout and all of this. So it is a matter of with the experience you learn where to set your priorities and when you're starting to make a course change in a tight situation, the course change is the -- what your main priority should be.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q Now, have you reviewed the evidence that -- in reviewing the evidence that was presented in this case, there are some names on the course recorder there. The area of transiting the Narrows --

A Uh-huh.

Q

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A That morning.

Yes, it seems to me 12:20. I would have to go back and look at the bell logger to determine, but it seems that time is in that area.

- Q From looking at the bell logger, does that refresh your recollection?
- A According to this, the command to stop was given at nineteen minutes and forty-nine seconds past the hour, and --
  - Q Of midnight?
  - A Yes. And it actually stopped at twenty.
- Q Now, the decision to restart the engine, what time was that according to the bell logger?
- A According to the bell logger, the order was given at thirty five minutes and fifty seven seconds past midnight.

  And it responded thirty six twelve.
- Q And does the label on the course recorder adequately reflect that restarting of the engine?
  - A Yes. That is in this area right up in here.
  - Q And what time was the vessel stopped that morning?
  - A Okay.

It was again stopped -- the order was given to stop it, one forty and fifty three seconds. It actually stopped one forty one and three seconds.

Q Okay.

And does that label on the course recorder

accurately reflect that point?

- A Yeah. That would be right up in here.
- Q Now, the bell logger -- in reviewing your information that was provided in this case, about what time was the pilot away?
  - A The pilot was away at 2324 -- with this log, 2324.
- Q And you see the label that is on there, is that approximately in that area?
  - A Yes.
- Q And the load program up signature, when did that occur?
  - A 2352. Does that sound right? I think so.
  - Q Is there a 2352 time period on the bell logger?
- A It would be on full ahead. But there's -- what would indicate that the program is coming up -- it says full ahead here, full ahead. And what would indicate it's coming up is the change in RPM's. There's no print out for a load program up. It would just be the fact that the -- it take;s forty minutes -- approximately forty minutes to come up from maneuvering up to full ahead, and this would be an indication that it's en route to that.
- Q Is the fact -- did the action to load program up occur some time between midnight and when the pilot was away?
- A It had to yes, because here you are at fifty one, that was shortly after they put it on full ahead. And fifty

five is considered full ahead maneuvering. That's what the vessel should come to. The fifty six indicates that that — they're never — they don't have to be exactly on. That would indicate that they are either on full ahead or he has already put the load program up at this point. However, this one you can tell definitely that it's increasing. Fifty six could still just be full ahead maneuvering. It doesn't necessarily mean it was loaded up before that. But sixty one would indicate that the vessel's increasing speed, definitely.

Q And in your opinion, did the vessel ground somewhere between nine o five and eighteen minutes after midnight that morning?

A Yeah, I think I had... (Start Tape C-3645)

A Yeah, I think I had figured out my estimate was 007, I believe, for the grounding. But there's been other people with other information that's changed on that, but that was my first time I worked it out.

- Q And did the vessel stop the engine -- the engine, was it stopped at 12:20 that morning?
  - A Yes; yes.
  - Q And it was restarted again at 12:36?
  - A Yes, it was.
  - Q And it was stopped again at 1:51?
  - A 1:41, yes.

Q 1:41.

Now, I would like to go to the events that occurred after the Exxon Valdez grounded.

A Okay.

Q What evidence have you reviewed during the period from the time after the vessel grounded until approximately 2:00 o'clock in the morning?

A Okav.

I have read everyone's statements that was involved in that on board. Mr. Kunkel; Mr. Cousins; the ABs on watch; the statement from the ABs off watch, what they had done; the engineers; all the crew. I read through the log book. Read all the material that the NTSB hearing had; all the material for the grand jury; all the material that -- all the statements from the Coast Guard investigator, from the State Trooper and the FBI.

- Q Have you ever been aground?
- A Not as a master. As a chief mate I was on a ship that ran aground.
  - Q Would you tell the jury about that?
- A Well, this was another tanker. It was down in Lake Maricaibo, Venezuela. Outbound, fully loaded, coming out a marked channel, and unfortunately the buoys were out of place in one section and the master turned the vessel and ran into the side of the channel which is --

. 19

Q When you say the buoys were out of place, would you explain to the jury what that means?

A Well, on a marked channel, you have buoys on each side of the channel coming out so that you keep between the buoys. For some reason, either misplacement or someone dragged the buoy over inadvertently or something, one buoy was out of place, and in keeping between the buoys, the master ran the ship into the mud.

- Q What happened when that happened?
- A Okay.

I was chief mate. I was out making sure the vessel was secured, getting ready to go to sea, and the master stopped the vessel, called me, told me that we were aground. Quick, take a look around. It was obvious that we weren't losing any oil, we weren't leaking any oil that we could tell right away. The first thing I did after that was take soundings around the vessel.

- Q Why do you do that?
- A So that you know what your situation is. Where you are grounded at, how much water you have where you're not grounded. How far into the mud that you are, how far into the ground you are.
  - Q Why is that important?
- A Eventually you are going to want to try to do something. This is just information to advise you what you

need to do and what action to take. That is one of the most important things with a grounding is to get soundings of the depth of the water around the ship to determine how badly you're grounded and what the situation is.

Q How do you take soundings?

A They have a hand lead line on the ship. It is merely a large piece of lead about this long and so big around, heavy with a marked hand line on it. And what you normally do is you drop that down. If you are interested in the type of bottom you have, you put tallow -- the little lead has an indentation. You put tallow in there, which will pick up sand or anything. If you you drop this lead down and it's all mud, the thing will come up muddy. You can tell you have a mud bottom. If you are on rock or in sand, you'll drop the lead down and it'll come up clean unless you have this tallow which some of the bottom will adhere to it, you'll see sand, you'll see gravel, what have you. And that determines what you -- you know, that's another aid in determining what action you want to take.

- Q How did you end up getting that vessel off?
- A Okay.

After checking the tanks and after all of this and determining what we had, where we were grounded, the captain sent me down to determine what would happen if we transferred cargo. Well, first he tried to back off, it didn't work. So

then we decided -- after we knew we were safe. So then we transferred cargo from forward to aft in order to tip the ship up, and lighten it up. We tried to back again. Didn't work. So then we got a tug boat to come out, and the tug boat pulled the ship from side to side to get it to rock so that we could -- and then we pulled the stern, backed to stern with him pulling on us, and we backed off.

- Q How long did that whole process take?
- A Probably from the time we grounded until we got off, twelve hours maybe.
  - Q Have you ever grounded on any other vessel?
- A Yeah, I was again chief mate on a ship coming out of the Sabine River in the Gulf of Mexico. And again, this is all mud. And at that point we were out of the river and into the Gulf which is quite shallow. And due to the vessels speeding up and having too much speed on it a vessel going through the water fast will squat, will come down in the water slightly. And we were in such shallow water that the vessel squatted and ran into the mud due to the extra draft of being pulled down. Which stopped the ship and it slithered around a while. When they stopped the engine, it actually broke itself loose from the bottom at that point, and then we proceeded on dead slow ahead or slow ahead, whatever the master decided and got on out of the shallow water into deeper water before we resumed our speed. And that vessel there, there was there

Q Well, was there -- what is -- what is the agreement as to being paid?

A The original agreement was to -- for a contractor -- up to a sum of \$20,000. And during the time of working here we exceeded that, and at present the limit is -- they put an addition on to that for \$30,000. Which we are working within that level now.

Q And what have your services included, as far as trips up to Alaska?

A Originally we came up to go out to the ship, look around and just check things so we'd make sure -- my purpose of being there was to advise the district attorney's office and the Troopers in what documents they might need, where they would be located probably, where we could find this, what information was needed. And then after we had made our trips out and got that, I spent time in the office going over all of this, explaining all of that to the district attorney's office. Kind of interpreting what maritime language meant in the legal language and kind of assisting in what -- what they were actually meaning and what -- also all the statements, what they were talking about when they used nautical terms. What they should have been doing, how the routine works on a ship, things of that nature.

Q Were you asked to come up and assist in the presentation of this case to the grand jury?

A Yes. I came up and I went through the same thing, explaining everything to the grand jury, presenting them with what facts we had gathered at that time and what I knew of the ship and the case and how — how we determined, say, where the ship had ended up aground, how we determined where they started. The usual evidence that you would present, I helped work on all of that.

Q Were you required to come up when the Exxon Valdez was visited at Naked Island?

A Yes. Just before they sailed I again came back up and went out and again we went over the ship, and at that time checked the steering gear and several other things, looked for things. All together I think I have made either five or six trips up here and spent untold days, I don't know just how much time, but considerable time.

Q Did you come up prior to the trial \_\_\_\_\_\_

A Yes. I've been up here -- I was up here it seems to me ten days, but I may be wrong -- nine or ten days before the trial started, and then I came back. And I have been up here now I think another ten days right now, something like that.

Q And can you give the jury an estimate of how much money your services are going to be? How much it is going to cost for your services in total?

A Well, assuming we are going to be finished now, be in the neighborhood of thirty -- between thirty and thirty

· 25

five thousand, somewhere in there, at the rate it stands now.

- Q Now, in this case did you review the statements of the individuals after the grounding of the Exxon Valdez?
  - A Yes.
- Q What information did you review from that period of 12:00 o'clock to, say, 2:00 o'clock in the morning of the 24th?
- A From 12:00 until 2:00? I reviewed all the -- Mr. Kunkel's statement, Mr. Cousins' statement, I reviewed the unlicensed personnel's statements, the engineer's statements. Everyone concerned with the vessel. I reviewed the statements of the people at the Vessel Traffic Center, I reviewed the statements of -- crew, Vessel Traffic Center -- all the statements there again collected by the FBI from these people. All these statements collected by the Coast Guard investigator and the Troopers.
- Q Now, when we left off we had talked briefly about becoming grounded on two occasions. Is there a difference between coming grounded on mud and being grounded, say, in Prince William Sound?
- A Well, yes, it's -- in mud you are less likely to do any structural damage to the vessel, less likely to -- it's more or less in the Mississippi River and Mississippi Delta and the Gulf ports, it's almost a common occurrence to run a ship aground in the mud and then float it off one way or the

other or be pulled off, or in fact power -- in the Mississippi River it's nothing uncommon just to power your way on through and even out on the Gulf the same as we did on the second occasion I referred to. And normally there is no damage done to the vessel. It is just soft mud, it absorbs the shock of the vessel hitting, unlike in Prince William Sound where you are more apt to have a rocky bottom, something that will damage the vessel.

Q If a vessel is grounded in Prince William Sound, what are the obligations and responsibilities of a master?

A Well, still it continues his obligation is the safety of the crew and as far as he can at that time the safety of the vessel.

Q What types of actions can he take to ensure -- to attempt to ensure --

A Well, in this situation it would be a case of notifying the crew, immediately get them aware of the situation, aware that they are in an extreme emergency. He could prepare his life saving and fire fighting equipment as soon as possible. They could check the — one thing that is very important to do is to make sure that all the crew is notified. It's not merely enough to send someone to call them, it's not enough if you sounded the general alarm, for example.

You would want to make a muster of your crew to see

that they were all awake, instruct them in what you wanted, which would include such things as being prepared with your survival suit, no smoking please, no use of electrical appliances, warn them. Most of them would be aware of the dangers though, with oil around and fumes and all, but repeat it again for the ones that may not be experience it. This is a dangerous situation, here's what I expect you to do, what I want you to do.

And then you would have them informed immediately, you would have them available to use in doing these other things such as preparing your life boats, preparing your fire fighting equipment.

Q Why is it important to have them congregate in an area, for instance?

A Well, in case of -- in case you need to abandon ship, this would reduce the time spent rounding the passen -- the crew up, and in case you needed them to do any work or anything to help alleviate the problem, they are there where you can get them immediately to go to work. And it -- if you leave them scattered throughout the ship, then if you need fire hoses strung out, you've got to send someone to get the people to do that. If you need someone to turn a valve or open a void space up to inspect for damage, you -- instead of having to look for your crew, you have them available to do this work.

O

Q Now, you indicated that it is necessary to have fire fighting equipment, you said it's obvious. But why is that?

A Well, any time you are dealing with petroleum, dealing with fumes from petroleum products, you have the potential for a fire or explosion or both, and you want to be prepared to -- if you do have a fire you want to be prepared to fight the fire and try to stop it as soon as possible.

Usually on a major ship, if it get's -- if it is not put out very early, it is beyond the scope of what the crew can handle.

Q How important is it to get that fire fighting equipment out immediately?

A It is critical; as soon as possible.

MR. COLE: Judge, can we approach the Bench for just a minute>

THE COURT: Yes.

(An off the record Bench conference was had.)

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q What other things do you need to establish after a grounding, as a master?

A Okay. You need to determine how you're aground, so you would -- back to the soundings. You would take soundings around the vessel. You need to determine the damage if any that's been done to the vessel. And how you would do this would be in the Exxon Valdez case with the print out from your

control room on your cargo tank. You would also have to go out visually and check the pump room, check any void spaces, any empty tanks that you have, and determine -- from that you can determine bottom damage, loss of cargo, loss of -- taking on water or something. You'd get a good idea of that. need to determine where you're grounded at as far as on the chart. You need to notify -- in this case you need to notify the VTC and they will go ahead -- they have a response program where they will notify all the appropriate people for you. And you need to pretty quickly determine the stability of your vessel. So you would have you chief mate doing this. And let's see -- the list -- you know, that's pretty much the immediate thing once you get the fire fighting, life saving. You've got the soundings. You need to determine if your double bottoms, your engine room, any void spaces, you need to -- you need to then determine what your best action is on the vessel to reduce the -- to reduce the damage that has already been done and to avoid any further damage.

- Q Now, after reviewing the evidence that you mentioned, do you have an opinion on what Captain Hazelwood was attempting to do between 12:38 p.m. -- or a.m., and 1:41 a.m., on March 24th, 1989?
  - A Yes, I do have an opinion.
  - Q What is that opinion.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Based on his phone conversations and based on the

use of the engine and the rudder, I believe he was trying to remove the vessel from the reef.

Q What risk was there from attempting to remove this vessel from the risk -- from the reef?

## A Okav.

You run the risk of further damage to the vessel, such as puncturing -- as you're going ahead, puncturing the void spaces in the pump room area, puncturing into the engine room. Possibly holing your other tanks that haven't been holed yet. And if you in fact do move it off -- are able to move it off the reef, the possibility of sinking or capsizing.

Also, while moving it off the reef, with this much oil being spilled in the water \_\_\_\_\_\_, you run the further risk of or you increase the risk of fire or explosion.

- Q Do you have any opinion on whether or not Captain Hazelwood used poor judgment in attempting -- in his actions taken after the Exxon Valdez grounded that morning?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Would you tell us what that opinion is?
- A I feel that he used very poor judgment in his actions, from the -- basically from the time they grounded until well after the engines had shut off at 1:41.
  - Q Would you tell the jury why you feel that way?
- A Well, there are several things. First, the time it took to shut the engines down originally, there's excessive

2

1

ی

5

6

8

10

11

13

14 15

, ,

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 · 23 there. The minute you ground, and once you get your ship steady up, realize you're aground, stop the ship immediately. As soon as possible.

Q Why is that?

To alleviate further damage. There's always the possibility of damaging the rudder, propeller, puncturing more holes in the tank. You know, the other possibilities are all there. I feel his action in not notifying the crew sooner, making sure all the crew was notified -- from the reports I get, there were two crew members who stated they didn't get notified. They should have -- instead of leaving the crew in their rooms scattered throughout the ship, he should have had them gathered up in one spot with their survival suits, life jackets, ready -- ready to -- to do something if they had to. Also if he had of used his entire crew to get his life boats and fire fighting equipment in order, he would have had that done much quicker. And in a situation like this, time was important. And then when he -- after stopping the engine and not -- not really finding out just were the was grounded, where are -- he didn't take soundings as I mentioned before. He didn't really have a good idea of what his situation was. he went ahead and resumed the engines and that was a very poor judgment in my opinion.

Q What about, if you were the captain of the Exxon Valdez and your third mate after the grounding called you up

,

\_ \_

and told you, Captain, we've got movement in all the center tanks and all of the starboard tanks, so we're definitely holed --

- A The chief mate, you mean?
- Q The chief mate.

What would that tell you about the extent of the damage that your vessel had suffered?

A Well, you have just suffered very, very, very major damage. That this is a major marine casualty. With that many tanks holed, you probably are losing your ability to stay afloat with that many tanks done. It would be a matter of considerable time to determine if in fact the vessel was capable of being refloated without salvage help. I certainly would -- I wouldn't want to just look at that and decide to go to sea.

Q What if after he told you that he then came to the bridge and told you that he had run the -- the ocean motions program, the cargo control program, and that what that told you was that the -- it was stable to go -- the vessel -- the stability of the vessel was acceptable, but the bending and stress moments had been exceeded and that you had -- and could not account for between a hundred thousand and a hundred and fifteen thousand of barrels of oil at that time. What would that tell you?

A There again, tell you that you're in serious

trouble. That this is a major damage to the structure of the vessel and the vessel -- almost at a glance, with ten holed tanks, you can say this vessel is unseaworthy and not something that you would want to try to go to sea with or try to do anything with. And as far as --

- When you say go to sea, what do you mean?
- A Well, we're going to get off the reef. I would want to do as little to move that vessel as possible at that time.

  And I would want to get help there to determine just what we could do as quick as possible.
- Q And if at some point later, after that, at say, 1:00 o'clock, around the 1:00 o'clock area, the chief mate came to the bridge and told you -- and you had gone ahead and made -- started to turn -- put the vessel on full maneuvering -- or full maneuvering speed and were negotiating rudder orders, if he came to the bridge and told you that the new print outs indicated that your stability was okay -- was not okay, and that your bend and stress moments were okay, what would that tell you at that time?
- A Still that at this point you still know you've got ten holed tanks and I wouldn't be trying to get off the reef.
- Q If you were going ahead at that time, what would you do?
  - A I'd stop the ship immediately, yeah.
  - Q Why is it Captain Hazelwood -- or Captain Beevers,

that you believe that the actions of the captain that evening were consistent with taking it off the reef and not trying to put it on the reef?

A Well, the -- if -- in order to put the vessel on the reef, to stay on the reed, he would have to know which direction the main part of the reef was. Now, with his vessel like it was and without soundings, without that, he had no idea if going ahead would put him on the reef or off the reef, actually. But by looking at the chart, you'll notice that the vessel is more towards the open water on the Prince William side. And if he was going to stay on the reef, he would not go full ahead to try to get out that way. If you're going to stay on the reef, you would have to know which direction your ship should be headed, and what to do, and you would probably do it in a dead slow or slow ahead manner, slow as you could run the engines.

Q And how would you turn the rudder?

A I wouldn't. That's -- unless you need -- that again, that depends on -- if you're laying at an angle to a reef that you want to turn around to head into, you might use the rudder one time to spin the ship one way, but you would not have a series of rudder maneuvers in order to stay grounded on a reef. You would -- that's inconsistent. If you -- the rudder movements is an indication he is trying to get the ship moving in order to get it to move ahead, and to move

ahead in this case is towards open water.

Q What about the tides and the incoming tide? How does that affect your decision?

Well, it is something that you have to consider. He was grounded not quite two hours before high tide. So he had two hours more of water coming in, and that is something to consider, but it is very doubtful that a ship grounded that hard with that much damage is going to refloat anyway. But he could be using — if it was felt that it might refloat, he may be better off using his time determining if he needed to ballast it in fact, and how to ballast it, if he could figure that out in that time. If not, that's a hard — a hard problem to figure right there because of the extent of damage.

But I wouldn't -- even with the tide coming in, I wouldn't expect the tide to raise a vessel that was that damaged up off the reef.

Q If you were attempting to keep yourself on the reef, and you had a high tide at 2:00 o'clock, how long would you run the engines?

A Well, if you're going to -- if you have to -- if you in fact are attempting to keep a vessel on a reef, and if that's what he was doing, he needed to do that right on through the high tide and for at least the same period after the tide as to when he grounded. Because you know, as the water comes up, if it provides any buoyancy at all, it will

provide buoyancy from the time he grounded through the next minute right on through the highest tide and it would continue to be more buoyant all the way 'til the tide got lower than it was when he grounded.

Q Does the fact -- did the fact that Captain Hazelwood did not run the vessel after high tide support your conclusion that he was trying to get off the reef?

A Yes. he didn't -- in fact, he shut down just before high tide, because it was -- yeah, that if he was trying to get off, he wouldn't worry about it after the tide -- high tide came and went.

Q Captain Beevers, I would like to read you the definition of reckless. In the State of Alaska, a person acts recklessly with respect to a result or to a circumstance described by a provision of law defining an offense when the person is aware of and consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the result will occur or that the circumstance exists. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that disregard of it constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a reasonable person would exercise in the situation.

Do you have an opinion as to whether or not Captain Hazelwood acted recklessly in his actions prior to the ship being grounded?

A Yes, I do.

8

10

12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19

20 . 21

22

2324

. 25

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, I'll object to the opinion. It invades the province of the jury, and that is their decision to make, not from the number of people who are going to come in here and give opinions.

THE COURT: Objection overruled. Under evidence rule 704 it can come in.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

- Q What is your opinion?
- A I feel that he was reckless in his actions.
- Q Why do you believe this concerning the actions taken prior to the grounding of the Exxon Valdez?
- A Prior to the grounding? His leaving the bridge in pilotage waters and in an area that it was such close quarters to navigate the vessel, with ice in the area, this is -- and you know, all the preceding things. The vessel's going too fast. They're too close to shoal water, they're too close to land, they're too close to ice. And in a situation where you needed all the experience he could muster on the bridge, he left and left an inexperienced man.
  - Q What was the risk that he created by leaving?
- A He created the risk of grounding the vessel. He created the risk of completely losing the vessel. He created the risk of fire and explosion and possible death to his crew. He created the risk of pollution, which was -- occurred.
  - Q Now, based on the opinion that I just -- the

25

definition that I just read to you, do you have an opinion as to whether Captain Hazelwood acted recklessly in his actions after the Exxon Valdez was grounded?

A Yes, I do.

MR. MADSON: Same objection.

THE COURT: Same ruling.

BY MR. COLE: (Resuming)

Q What is that opinion?

A My opinion is that his lack of response to the grounding, originally, his slowness in getting things going and then his -- his attempting to remove the vessel from the reef without knowing the results, was a reckless act that there again endangered the vessel, the crew, and endangered the environment and the fact that he could have spilled considerably more oil if in fact the vessel had sank or capsized. And again, this same danger of explosion and/or fire was increased.

MR. COLE: I have nothing more.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MADSON:

Q Captain Beevers, I am not standing here in the sight of God, am I? You aren't perfect, are you?

MR. COLE: Objection; argumentative.

THE COURT: Mr. Madson, that's improper.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

- Q Well, you aren't perfect, Mr. Beevers, are you?
  A Oh, no; no.
  Q Have you ever made mistakes?
  A I've made a lot of them.
  - Q Ever use bad judgment?
  - A I've used bad judgment, yes.
  - Q Ever had somebody be paid to evaluate your judgment and decide whether or not it was good or bad?
    - A No, I haven't.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

Q Is it fair to say but for chance, grace of God or something, you might be sitting in Captain Hazelwood's place?

MR. COLE: Objection; argumentative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

Q Chance, is there a possibility or a chance that in your career, and the mistakes you have made and the judgment you have exercised, you could have, but for again, chance, been in the situation where you could be on trial here?

A I don't like the word, except for chance in there. There is a -- you know, any time you go to sea and any time you're a master on a vessel and have that responsibility and that big of an item under your control, there's things that you can do that where you have made a mistake and do something wrong that you can definitely be in serious trouble and you can ground your vessel.

23

24

25

A Yes. And there again my response is you have to everything you can to avoid this, and when it happens, you have to do everything you can to get out of the situation with as little damage as you can.

11

13

14

15 16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q That's just common sense, isn't it? You try to avoid accidents, if you can, and if you are in one you try to minimize the damage afterwards or do the best you can after the event has occurred?

- A That's right; yes.
- Q Now, getting to your history, you said you did not receive any formal schooling or training, correct? That is an academy, a marine academy?
  - A Yes, that's right; yeah.
  - Q Did you go to sea as an AB first then or what?
  - A I went as an ordinary seaman.
  - Q Were you a union member?
  - A Yes, I was.
- Q Union member all the way until you became an officer?
- A I was a union member from my first job right on through until I retired. Various -- first the Seafarers International Union as unlicensed, and then I joined the Master, Mates and Pilots, and I was always in a union, right on until I retired.
  - Q So what union were you in at the time you retired?
  - A Master, Mates and Pilots.
- THE COURT: Could you move that microphone up a little bit? You have a soft voice.
  - THE WITNESS: Up a little bit?

11

12

18

19

20

21

25

Α

Yes.

24 |

25

command?

A When you --

25

Q When I say command, under the command of a captain but still stand the watch --

A You are deemed by the Coast Guard to be capable of taking over a watch, normal watch on a ship, and standing watch, yes.

- Q And that could include times when the captain is not on the bridge and you are there alone?
  - A Oh, yes.
- Q No restrictions on that as far as the Coast Guard is concerned?
  - A No.
- Q And a second mate's license is one that is one more up the ladder, is it not?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q More experience on vessels is required?
- A You have to have minimum of twelve months as third mate, twelve months on a vessel, in order to set for a second mate's license, yes.
- Q And the test is presumably more difficult than that of a third mate?
- A Slightly more difficult, yes. They succeedingly get a few more -- it's basically the same thing with just a little harder each time.
- Q Now when -- oh, by the way, on your license, you've got a radar observer.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

- Q What does that entail?
- A That's again you have to pass a radar observers -back years ago you had to pass a test and the Coast Guard, and
  now they have -- I believe what they do is they have various
  approved schools that you take a small course, three day
  course, one day course or a week, whatever you want, and then
  you show that instructor that you are competent and he send
  this over to the Coast Guard. I don't think the Coast Guard
  gives that test any more. But they still approve the schools
  that give the test.
- Q By the way, you don't hold an active license at this time --
  - A I didn't renew my license when I retired, no.
- Q You mentioned -- getting back to this other point, you mentioned that you were basically retired, you do a small consulting -- amount of consulting, and you have another business. What's that other business?
  - A Construction business.
  - O It's what?
  - A Construction.
  - Q What kind of construction?
- A I do everything from building buildings to cement work to foundations, commercial floors, sidewalks around schools, to name a few of the things I've done. Built a horse

23

24

25

arena, built garages, built commercial -- fisherman's commercial repair and storage area, things of that sort.

- Q So it is fair to say you basically you are a building contractor?
  - A It takes about half of my time, yes.
  - Q Okay, one half of you time?
  - A Uh-huh.
  - Q The other, you are consulting the other half?
  - A The other half is spent with whatever I want to do.
- Q Well, if we look at that half, the half where you're not out there building sidewalks and such.
  - A Yeah, sure.
- Q How much of that is spent consulting in maritime cases?
  - A Until this case, very little.
- Q Well, speaking of this case, you got it because of Mr. -- Captain Greiner, did you not?
- A I got it because Mr. Linton from the DA's office called me and said that Curt Greiner had give him my name as a -- knowing that I was a former tanker captain that had run in and out of Puget -- Prince William Sound.
- Q And you have a contract with the State that is going to pay perhaps \$35,000 before we're done here?
  - A Possibly.
  - Q But you have to kick back or give Mr. Greiner ten

percent of that, right?

A I give -- I wouldn't call it a kickback. I pay a fee to him for the --

- Q A finder's fee he gets?
- A That's a fee, whatever you want to call it; that's a fee.
  - Q The more you charge, the more he gets, right?
  - A I guess, indirectly, yes.
- Q You said that you had done just a small amount of maritime consulting until this case came along. What do you mean by a small amount?
- A Well, a day here, a day there, couple of days, whatever. I spent -- well, I spent a few hours on the phone to Central Gulf. Spent a day doing some running around for stuff for them one time on a case that I -- on a ship that I had been on that they needed me to do some work for getting their -- they had lost their customs entry paper, a minor thing that was nothing. And I have spent time -- like I say, I am not a professional consultant that makes my living doing this. I mean, is that what you wanted to know?
- Q Okay. That's what I was getting at. You don't consider that to be a major part of your income?
- A No. I don't expect to make a living off from coming up here on tankers that's run aground, no, if that's what you're getting at. I'll answer that right away.

Q You'll have to admit, would you agree, that \$35,000 is a fairly substantial fee?

A I put a lot of work in it, but yes, it is a substantial fee.

Q Well, you put in as much work as you want to basically, don't you? You are paid by the contract limit, but as much as you want to do up to that limit?

A No, it's as much as they require me to do. I can't just say I am going to work on this for the next ten days and they -- it depends on what the -- what the district attorney's office feel that they need, what is required. And I suppose if I wanted to, you could pad that. But that's not the way you do business. But I have done what they ask, I have done it when they have asked. And if they have sent me stuff to read, and I send them back -- I haven't sent them back anything, but to discuss with them, I have done that. And they have never said, well, did you spend two hours on that or two days on that. They just assumed that I did it in the time that was --

Q Sure. You give them basically hourly -- so many hours per week billing?

A What I bill them is days that I actually put in or time that I actually put in, and I do that usually on a monthly basis.

Q And is that per hour?

· <del>-2</del>5

A It depends. Up here -- it's based on a per hour basis, yes.

Q The State obviously has the power to more or less tell you the scope of your duties. In other words, they want you to look at certain things, right?

A Oh, yes. That's what they -- they hired me for a specific thing.

Q At the same time, if you feel something else is important, you certainly have the right to go to them and say, hey, I think we ought to do more in this area or go over here and this.

A That was part of my original employment was to look at things and see what was necessary and what the needed, yes.

Q I think you said that one of your -- one of the things you were hired to do was basically help them put their case together is what you said, grand jury and all that.

A I was here to tell them about the maritime field. I don't know if I said put it together. If I did, I don't mean to imply that I was running their case for them or something. I assisted them and I pointed out things that might not be in the usual things that an attorney would run across on a ship. That's --

Q Well, one of the the things they must have told you early on is what they needed. In other words, what they expected you to assist them on, right?

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

A Yes.

Q In other words, hey, we've got to show this guy was reckless. Can you help us do that?

A No. Time after time they told me be objective in your decisions. And Mr. Cole has asked me two or three times, now do you feel comfortable saying this. If you don't, don't go any further with it. And that's -- at any time it is just a matter of saying I don't think that this is what I want to say and that's it.

- Q He asked you if you felt comfortable with that situation.
  - A Certainly, yeah.
  - Q Did he ask you that twice to be real sure?
  - A No.
- Q Well, if he had to ask you if you were comfortable, doesn't that imply there's some doubts about whether you were comfortable or not?
- A I see your point. No, this merely means -- what this means is that, you know, that they are not out to hang the man, they're just trying to get as objective view.
- Q And of course that objective view is one for which you are being paid?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Uh-huh.

Now, we talked early on about pilotage. You said

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any requirement you had to be on the bridge all the time?

Α I was up there for every trip, yes. You had to -there was a pilot on the bridge that would sign you -- when you made a trip in and out he would sign your ticket. Now, I don't know there again if anybody was checking us to see if we were standing on the bridge.

- You didn't have to be on the bridge? Q
- You did if you wanted to learn your route, yes. Α
- 0 What was the route? To go through Prince William Sound. What's there to look at?
- It was determined that they needed pilotage, so that's what we did.
- You go through Cape Hinchinbrook and then there's Naked Island, and you've got a light -- there's a buoy at Bligh Reef. There's navigation aid at Busby Island, things like this?

Α

Uh-huh.

\_

. 15

Q That's what you're supposed to learn, right?

A This wasn't for me to decide that we needed it. I just had to go comply with it and get the pilotage.

Q Yeah, but in other words, the requirement was merely that you made so many transits? The requirement was not that you had to navigate the vessel, steer the vessel or anything else.

A Not at that time. You're there as an observer. And the way I interpreted the word observer is that we had to be on the bridge observing.

Q You spend any substantial time down below on these trips, not on the bridge?

A I went below during my observing trips, there again, out in the open waters. So you stayed -- you came up for the important points, you stayed there most of the time. And due to the fact there was fifteen or twenty people there, naturally if you wanted to go to the bathroom, there was no facilities to feed us on the bridge, so at lunch time you would pick a spot and you'd take a break and go eat. So in that respect we weren't on the bridge during the entire observer trip. But the observer is not required on there, the trip is required. And you -- that's --

Q You could be asleep the whole time for that matter, right?

Uh-huh.

Busby Island?

Α

24

25

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

Q Anyway, you could be a good driver without having a driver's license, isn't that fair to say?

A You can be a good driver without that. You run the risk of violating the law.

Q But having a license does not make you a good driver or a bad driver?

A No.

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Q It is simply a test of your ability to be a good driver, right?

A Yes.

Q And relating that then to the pilotage endorsement, that is a test of one's knowledge of the Prince William Sound area, for instance.

A Yes.

Q And you could have that knowledge and be just as expert as having the pilotage endorsement, but you just don't -- you don't have that piece of paper, right?

A Yeah.

Q For instance, in your -- by the way, you mentioned that the -- every time you mentioned what you looked at, as far as other statements and other witnesses are concerned, to form your opinion, you did not mention any trial testimony, I think, except one time you said Mr. Kunkel and Mr. Cousins' trial testimony>

\_

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

A Yeah, I don't know if it was just once, but those are the only two that I have read so far. I haven't read the other testimony of the other people.

- Q Why did you have just those two?
- A Because they were more what I was concerned with, what they had to say, than -- I didn't -- what I am here for is the navigating of the vessel and the grounding right there, not other such thing -- other things that happened.
- Q Well, there were other people on board. Could they not assist in determining whether or not Captain Hazelwood's actions were appropriate or not appropriate and that testified here in this Court?
  - A That could be, I don't know.
- Q For instance the pilot, Mr. Murphy. Do you know him?
  - A Oh, yes.
  - Q You know he testified.
- A I haven't received his testimony yet. The -- I read Murphy's earlier statements, that is his statements to NTSB.
- Q Do you feel sir, sometimes with a forum such as we have here where there are not only statements given, but cross examination and the means and the method to probe into things and perhaps bring more facts and more data out that could be of additional value to in forming an opinion?
  - A It could be, yes.

24

Q You also talked a great deal about ice. I think you spent a lot of time with Mr. Cole and his questions and your responses about ice in Prince William Sound. Is it fair to say from your experience that the amount of ice coming from Columbia Glacier has increased in the later years when you were sailing up there?

A Yes.

- Q For whatever phenomenon that causes that, there was an increase?
  - A Yes.
  - Q The Coast Guard was aware of that.
  - A Yes.
- Q All people, all masters of vessels going in and out of Prince William Sound were aware of that, right?
  - A Yes.
  - Q The port was never closed because of ice, was it?
  - A Not that I know of, no.
- Q Coast Guard had the authority to do that if they felt the situation was that dangerous, did they not?
  - A Yes, they did.
- Q And you said sometimes it was a problem and sometimes it wasn't, right?
  - A Yes.
- Q And certainly the ability to determine whether or not it was a problem was dependent upon a number of factors,

right? I don't want to mislead you, but for instance, you have ice reports.

- A Yes.
- Q The ice report is only as good as the observations that were made, right?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Time, of course, if it was an older report or a fresh one, right?
  - A That's right.
- Q And even then you had to be pretty close to it to actually be able to see it even on radar or visually?
  - A That sounds fair, yes.
- Q And at night, it would be much more difficult to see visually?
  - A That's right.
- Q In fact, let's assume -- by the way, did you look at the weather for this particular night, 23rd-24th?
- A There was -- yes, there -- I checked the weather, yeah.
  - Q It was quite dark, was it not?
- A It was dark. It had been some overcast earlier and apparently by the time they were out in the Bligh Reef area there was fairly good visibility because they spotted the -- they were able to pick up the lights at a reasonable distance.
  - Q And the ice that you could see visually at night, of

and tabular and design or with a higher plane maybe that is white, easy to pick up. Some of the smaller growlers have been rolled around enough that they have lost their whiteness and it's a little harder to detect those. But those are usually the smaller pieces. The larger pieces are easier to see and easier to pick up on radar.

How about the amount of debris they may have in the iceberg, or ice chunk?

yeah, if you got a lot of rock and debris coming Α down on it, that would discolor the whiteness, yes.

- It discolors it, but I mean how --Q
- Α Oh, you mean for seeing it?

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Yeah, for seeing it, yeah. A
- Well, naturally white is easier to see at night than -- than a dark object.
- But would you say that radar would be at least one Q more source of reference a master would have in determining

10

13

12

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

the amount of ice and the type of ice he was going to encounter?

A Oh, yes. If your first initial view of the ice at night, that would be your initial contact with the ice is through radar. You would pick radar up -- you would pick it up on radar before you would see it visually.

Q And of course that also depends on a number of factors, does it not? The amount of ice, the range you're looking at it, things like this?

A Yeah. But you would expect to see it -- see ice on radar at a further distance than you would see it visually.

- Q And of course there is no way of going back to the night of March 23rd and recreating what Captain Hazelwood or the third mate saw looking in that radar, right?
  - A Not that I know of, no.
- Q It would be certainly helpful if we could do that, but we can't, right?
  - A That's right.
- Q We have to use hindsight and decide, like you have, as to whether or not he exercised good or bad judgment, right? Would you agree it's a lot easier to do eleven months later looking back at just papers and records as opposed to actually being there?
- A Yes, it certainly is easier later. But my decision on Captain Hazelwood was not made on the little individual

22

23

24

25

things like that. It was made on his behavior in leaving the vessel -- leaving the bridge, not on what he saw.

Q Well, on that point, sir, you are not speaking for the national United States maritime industry, are you?

MR. COLE: Objection.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

Q In your opinion?

A I am speaking for my -- what I know has been traditionally a master's responsibility and duties.

Q What I am saying sir, is you don't have a survey conducted by every retired master, for instance, as to whether or not they agreed with you or not --

A I never asked a single one if they agreed with me or not, no.

Q Why not?

MR. COLE: Objection; relevance, hearsay.

MR. MADSON: It goes to the basis of his opinion, your Honor, if we want to find out whether anybody else agreed with him or not.

THE COURT: I am going to overrule the objection.

You can answer the question.

BY MR. MADSON: (Resuming)

- Q So you never asked anybody to --
- A I don't know that it is necessary that I have a lot of people agree with me on my opinion.

I believe Salser is in the -- I don't know for sure

25

Α

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2425

that they made the one in the Exxon Valdez, but it would be similar because it is a slow speed diesel, yes.

- Q Maybe you can explain the difference so everybody understands. I mean, there's different means of propulsion in a ship. Steam turbine, right?
- A Let's don't get too far into this because engineering is not my -- you know, I am a deck officer and I know a little about the engines, but I am not an engineer.
- Q So as a master then you really don't have that much responsibility over the engine and how it is run and how the chief engineer runs the show down there?
- A I think I stated that the chief engineer runs the engine room, but that the problems in the engine room are still under the master's authority as master of the vessel.

  And unfortunately it is under his responsibility. You know, they the master is responsible for everything that goes on on the ship.
- Q But certainly he would rely on the judgment of a good chief engineer, would he not, one he is confident --
  - A Yes, yes; you would have to, yes.
- Q He is in an area like you have just said, that you're a little unsure, you don't know.
  - A Uh-huh.
- Q Now, I don't want to ask you detailed questions about this, just the basic difference maybe between the two.

They had instructions. I don't know if it was in a

manual form. I assume -- every company I have ever worked for

2

3

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Α

has had a notebook or a bound book or a book with instructions of how they expect you to operate the vessel. Most of them aren't as extensive with direct duties as the Exxon manual is.

- Q When did you first see the Exxon manual?
- A When this -- out on board the Exxon Valdez.
- Q Uh-huh.

And what other companies have you worked for?

A I worked -- originally on my license I worked for Victory Carriers, on the one freighter that I was on. I worked for United Maritime out of New York, which is a tanker company that is no longer in business. I worked for Maritime Overseas. Worked for Central Gulf on one trip. I worked for OMI Corporation for the last couple of years or so in the Columbia.

- Q And these manuals are guidelines, are they not?
- A Oh, yes. That's --
- Q Wouldn't you agree, sir, that it would be extremely difficult for any company to lay down hard and fast rules as to what a master should or should not do?
- A Yes. They are merely guidelines and if you -- if you want to do anything different than that, you certainly have the authority as master to do something different than that.
- Q In other words the master has a lot of discretion in his judgment, does he not? What to do, what not to do?

7 .

3

A The problem with this, he has the authority to do that, yes, and he can do it at any time that -- the problem that he would have is with the company saying, well, this is - in other words he can do it legally, but the company may then say you are not following our guidelines and go from there as an employee-company thing. But as far as legally, the master has the authority to override the company guidelines and do what he thinks is best for the vessel.

- Q So the observance or non-observance of company guideline or policy is certainly not a crime?
  - A Not that I know of, no.
- Q In fact, there is no requirement by the State of Alaska, for instance, that companies have to have rules and regulations on how to operate a tanker vessel?
- A I think for the Alaska trade they have -- I don; t know now -- they are requiring certain procedures and plans in certain instances -- and for emergencies and things. Now -- but that's just come up lately and I am really not familiar with just what they are requiring.
- Q You didn't look at any of those and evaluate any state laws or regulations and how they may or may not relate to this case?
- A Not the -- I am not the attorney. My idea -- what I was brought here for was to explain what a master should be doing on a vessel.

Q That was my fault. You spoke about some -- and frankly I didn't understand what your --

A Okay.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They are making -- they may even be in force, manuals with guidelines on what to do in specific things in the Alaska trade, and just what it is I don't know. So maybe we had better just say I don't know on this.

- Q Sounds fair; you don't know.
- A Yeah.
- Q Nor were you ever given any of these things to look at and examine?
  - A No.
- Q But you said that you were given particular -- well, maybe you were or weren't. Particular laws or statutes by the State to see how this case would fit within a particular statute or didn't fit? Were you given that assignment?
- A I wasn't given and assignment to see where it would fit, no.
  - Q Were you given --
- A The only thing I have ever got in that was in with all of my notes that I got was a note explaining what reckless meant and what a few other things meant. That's --
  - Q When did you first get that definition, sir?

- A That i don't remember.
- Q Some time ago?

A That would be in the after part of the investigation that I received that, in the last -- in other words, it wasn't when I first went on board the ship, it wasn't immediately. It would be, I would say, in the last two times I have been up here.

- Q Oh, by the way, I am glad you mentioned that. When you travel back and forth from you home up here, you are paid in addition to your 30,000 or \$35,000?
  - A My expenses are paid, yes.
- Q So your out of pocket expenses are paid by the State of Alaska, right?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Anyway it's --

THE COURT: Would this be a good time for us to break?

MR. MADSON: It wouldn't matter, your Honor, we have a long way to go yet.

THE COURT: I figured so. Ladies and gentlemen, we will release you until 8:15 a.m. tomorrow morning. As I indicated to you earlier, there is considerable media information being disseminated through the television, newspaper and radio concerning this case, and I have admonished you on several occasions to disregard any

information concerning the oil spill. And that is a broader category than just this case. That would refer to any information concerning anybody who might have been involved, whether it would be the defendant in this case, the State of Alaska, Alyeska, Exxon, anything concerning the oil spill is off limits. So -- and I advised you earlier that as an alternative if that instruction is too onerous and cannot be followed, we always have the right of sequestration. That is not necessary at this time according to counsel and so I won't impose that, so long as I am satisfied that you can follows that instruction.

I know it's a difficult instruction because you are going to have to have somebody screen the newspapers, you're going to have to avoid certain hours of television, and I imagine almost every radio station has a little news blurb every half hour, so I know it is difficult. But it is very important for you not to be exposed to information in this case.

So with that final reminder I am going to let you go until tomorrow. Please don't discuss the case, don't form or express any opinions concerning it.

I need to talk to counsel just briefly.

(Whereupon the jury exited the Courtroom.)

THE COURT: You may step down.

(The witness stands aside.)

THE COURT: Thank you.

٦.

How many more witnesses after this one?

MR. COLE: Four. Oh, five.

THE COURT: And do you expect to be completed by

Friday now? Is that a realistic approach?

MR. COLE: Thursday or Friday.

THE COURT: Thursday. All right then, would you be prepared to start with your first witness on Friday if we got finished on Thursday?

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, that has been one of the difficulties we have been faced with here, is trying to figure out, you know, when we are going to start. For instance, I had an expert that could be here Friday but next week is going to be very bad for him. So we were hoping to use him, and I would hate to have him come here on Thursday for -- we don't know, I guess we have just got to play it by ear. But to answer your question, yes, we certainly would anticipate to do that.

THE COURT: I was considering the possibility of, if mr. Cole finished the State's case on Thursday, leaving Friday open for administrative matters concerning this case. There might be some motions, anything else we might be able to -- to do on Friday, and then let you start your case on Monday. But if you had a witness you needed to call on Friday, we could do that.

MR. MADSON: Your Honor, could we just kind of wait and see on that. If there case ends up late on Thursday, maybe that would be the best thing to do.

THE COURT: Would that be a problem, for the State to do something like that?

MR. COLE: No.

THE COURT: Well, we will just play it by ear.

Is there anything else we can do now before we recess for the day? I am asking you twice.

MR. MADSON: I feel comfortable in saying no.

THE CLERK: This Court stands in recess.

(Thereupon, at 1:31 o'clock p.m., the Court stood in recess.)

SUPERIOR COURT 3ANS89-7217 STATE OF ALASKA Case No. 3ANS89-7218

I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was typed by me and that said transcript is a true record of the recorded proceedings to the best of my ability.