

**User Name:** donyAYCEProd antony

**Date and Time:** Oct 18, 2014 4:02 p.m. EDT

**Job Number:** 13841867

## Document(1)

1. Human error in recreational boating

**Client/Matter:** Dony1

**Narrowed by:**

**Content Type**  
Scientific

**Narrowed by**  
-None-

March 2007

**Section:** Pgs. 398-405 Vol. 39 No. 2 ISSN: 0001-4575

**Length:** 6296 words

**History:** Received: June 6, 2006; Revised: September 2, 2006; Accepted: September 10, 2006

**Author:** A. James McKnight (a) [ajamesmcknight@comcast.net](mailto:ajamesmcknight@comcast.net); Wayne W. Becker (b); Anthony J. Pettit (c); A. Scott McKnight (d)

*(a) Transportation Research Associates, 78 Farragut Road, Annapolis, MD 21403, United States*

*(b) Salutory Technology Inc., 309 E. Central Ave., Moorestown, NJ 08057, United States*

*(c) USCG, 12606 Santa Rosa Circle, Lusby, MD 20657, United States*

*(d) Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 11710 Beltsville Drive, Suite 300, Calverton, MD 20705, United States*

## Body

---

### ABSTRACT

Each year over 600 people die and more than 4000 are reported injured in recreational **boating accidents**. As with most other **accidents**, human error is the major contributor. U.S. Coast Guard reports of 3358 **accidents** were analyzed to identify errors in each of the **boat** types by which statistics are compiled: auxiliary (motor) sailboats, cabin motorboats, canoes and kayaks, house **boats**, personal watercraft, open motorboats, pontoon **boats**, row **boats**, sail-only **boats**. The individual errors were grouped into categories on the basis of similarities in the behavior involved. Those presented here are the categories accounting for at least 5% of all errors when summed across **boat** types. The most revealing and significant finding is the extent to which the errors vary across types. Since **boating** is carried out with one or two types of **boats** for long periods of time, effective **accident** prevention measures, including safety instruction, need to be geared to individual **boat** types.

### FULL TEXT

#### 1 Introduction

In a typical year, over 600 recreational boaters die, and more than 4000 are reported injured, in U.S. waters. The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) collects reports of **boating accidents** and reports them annually in "**boating statistics**". The various **accidents** are categorized by type, such as "capsizing" or "collision with vessel", and contributors such as "weather" or "drug use". Information as to the conditions and events contributing to **boating accidents** can be very useful in guiding preventive efforts. Most **accidents** on the water involve multiple causes. Probably one of the better-known examples is the sinking of Titanic. While the direct cause was collision with an iceberg, other contributing causes include a northerly route, limited visibility, and failure to limit speed accordingly. Insight into the causes of **boating accidents** can help in reducing the incidence of death and injury by allowing educational, enforcement, and other preventive efforts to focus upon those factors that play the largest role in bringing them about.

##### 1.1 Identification of **accident** causes

Some analyses of **accidents** reserve the term "cause" to that which directly results in unintentional damage or injury, treating those events which lead up to the cause as "contributors". However, more common usage in **accident** analysis accepts as a cause any factor without which the **accident**, or its consequences, would not have occurred, often referred to as the "but for" criterion. Although it was collision with an iceberg that caused the Titanic to sink, a more southerly route, better visibility *or* slower speed would have prevented the collision and the sinking. The series of events leading

up to the accident is frequently referred to as a "causal chain". Since avoiding any one of the causes would have prevented the accident, no distinction is made among them. In the case of catastrophic accidents, such as those involving commercial airliners, passenger trains and ocean liners, analyses of individual accidents lead to measures that are largely successful in preventing recurrence of the same causative factors.

Accidents involving vehicles operated by the general public are far too numerous, and the array of causes far too varied to make analysis of individual events a useful source of preventive measures. Fortunately, there are processes under which information concerning the circumstances surrounding certain accidents are routinely collected and processed. In the case of traffic accidents above a specified cost, drivers of the vehicles involved are required to obtain and submit forms on which the circumstances surround the event are described. Where there is personal injury, police may be summoned and trained analysts record information related to causes. But a particularly informative source is research into accident causes, undertaken by specialists trained in accident analysis.

The identification of accident causes can take two different routes. One is a process in which investigators study the circumstances surrounding the accident and make inferences as to the causes, much in the same manner as single catastrophic accidents. The most intensive investigative effort to identify causes of traffic accidents is that of <sup>Treat et al., 1977</sup> whose team analyzed 2258 accidents in Indiana. The results revealed the influence failure to properly recognize the danger due to inattention or inadequate visual search (56%), making the wrong decision (52%), and performance errors (11%). The driver's physical and mental condition played a relatively small role. Highway factors contributed to 21% of accidents and vehicle factors to 12%.

Though an investigative process is useful in learning the immediate causes of accidents, many of the influences are too remote in the causative chain to be accurately identified through analysis of the accident itself and inferred through statistical analysis. The most thorough application of statistics employs "case-control" methodology, comparing the characteristics of drivers, vehicles, and environmental factors involved in accidents with those of a comparable sample drawn from the population at large. Extraneous differences between case and controls samples are controlled statistically. Perhaps the best recognized use of such analysis is where the blood alcohol levels of fatally injured drivers are compared with measures taken from drivers selected at random in roadside checks. This method was applied to operators and passengers in recreational boating by <sup>Smith et al., 2001</sup> and found the odds of death at various blood alcohol levels to be similar to that for automobiles. Beyond alcohol, the same approach has been used to compare injuries to belted- and unbelted-drivers. The separation of investigative and statistical approaches parallels the distinction between "latent" and "active" conditions leading to accidents put forth by <sup>Reason, 1990</sup>.

## 1.2 Human error in accidents

The results of the Treat et al. analyses referenced earlier point to the role of driver error in automobile accidents. While there is a wealth of information on "human factors" in accident causation, very little of it has dealt specifically with human error. Since errors are particularly frequent among novices, <sup>McKnight and McKnight, 2003</sup> analyzed accidents of 2128 beginning drivers and found a similar pattern with lack of attention and visual search errors predominating. Of particular interest is that speed contributed to about the same percentage of accidents but that speeds too great for road and traffic conditions rather than high speeds that were primarily responsible. Although the analysis of 900 motorcycle

---

<sup>Treat et al., 1977</sup> Treat et al., 1977. J.R. Treat, N.S. Tumbas, S.T. McDonald, D. Shinar, R.D. Hume, R.E. Mayer, R.L. Stansifer, N.J. Castellan; Tri-level Study of the Causes of Traffic Accidents, vol. I: Causal Factor Tabulations and Assessments, vol. II: Special Analyses; Government Printing Office (Indiana University, Institute for Research in Public Safety), Washington, DC (1977), .

<sup>Smith et al., 2001</sup> Smith et al., 2001. G.S. Smith, P.M. Keyl, J.A. Hadley, C.I. Bartley, R.D. Foss, W.G. Tolbert, J. McKnight; Drinking and recreational boating fatalities: a population-based case-control study; JAMA; Vol. 286, No. 23; (2001), .

<sup>Reason, 1990</sup> Reason, 1990. J. Reason; Human Error; Cambridge University Press, New York (1990), .

<sup>McKnight and McKnight, 2003</sup> McKnight and McKnight, 2003. A.J. McKnight, A.S. McKnight; Young novice drivers: careless or clueless; Accident Anal. Prev.; Vol. 35, No. 6; (2003), pp. 921-926.

accidents by <sup>Hurt et al., 1981</sup> revealed many contributing factors, it did not address human error. In-depth review of the narratives by a research staff consisting of experienced riders was highly revealing of errors leading to the accidents (McKnight et al., 1980). Of particular interest was the effect of failure to use the front wheel brake in emergencies, even though it supplies three-quarters of the braking power in sudden stops. General aviation, unlike its commercial counterpart, has large enough numbers of crashes to permit meaningful analysis of human error. <sup>Shappell and Wiegmann, 1997</sup> developed a taxonomy of human errors in general aviation and applied it to 2291 fatal accidents, finding poor planning to be the leading cause by far. In a study of 431 cases, <sup>Baker et al., 2001</sup> found errors in use of aircraft controls to be involved in 70% of crashes, far higher than that for automobiles. However, inattention played a similar role, about 27%. Identification of errors leading to accidents can play a prominent role of their prevention; since the Titanic, collisions with icebergs have been eliminated. In the air, disasters due to certain errors in navigation, de-icing, and traffic control have been eliminated. While accident-producing errors in attention or visual search by the driving public would not be eliminated, focusing attention on the leading contributors can improve the effectiveness of preventive measures.

Where analysis has addressed recreational boating accidents, it has largely focused upon a limited array of variables, as are presented annually in <sup>United States Coast Guard, 2004</sup>. These include some 18 "contributing factors" that are "operator controllable". Almost all involve errors of some type and reveal the role, played by such errors as inattention and lack of proper lookout, contributors to accidents in other forms of transportation as well. The implications of these factors for prevention of accidents are not as entirely clear. For example, "excessive speed" would benefit from clarification. Does it mean in general, making turns at too great a speed or operating at high speeds in rough water. Somewhat tighter specification of errors would be helpful in guiding preventive efforts. A second limitation of available statistics is the lack of delineation by boat type. The fact that open motorboats account for about half of all boating injury accidents tends to place their operator errors high on the list. Problems handling current, which contribute heavily to canoe and kayak accidents, do not appear on the list. One reason is that they account for only 2% of all injury accidents (although they are second only to open motorboats in drownings). Given the prospect of differences across boat types in the errors leading to accidents, any analysis of human error needs to be delineated by boat type to provide information that can be applied to preventive measures.

One clear obstacle to the identification of human error through investigative analysis of accidents is the lack of direct access to such information in accident investigations. While operator, vehicle, roadway and environmental characteristics are observable at the scene, the behavior of the drivers is not. It must be inferred from that which is observable at the scene and from interviews with drivers and witnesses. Some degree of inaccuracy enters the information that is collected, its interpretations by investigators, and inferences drawn by analysts. However, no form of accident analysis is free of error. Case-control methodology relies on the ability to match the two groups using available information, which rarely includes all possible confounding variables. Both methods can, and have succeeded in revealing effects large enough to make them appropriate targets of prevention efforts.

## 2 Methods

The identification of human error in recreational boating involved the analysis of some 3358 accident reports drawn the 1996–1998 BARD files. Initially, two members of the project staff analyzed 1000 accidents drawn from the 1997

---

<sup>Hurt et al., 1981</sup> Hurt et al., 1981. Hurt Jr., H.H., Ouellet, J.V., Thom, D.R., 1981. Motorcycle accident cause factors and identification of countermeasures, vol. I. Technical Report. Traffic Safety Center, University of Southern California, DOT-HS 805 862, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

<sup>McKnight et al., 1980</sup> McKnight et al., 1980. A.J. McKnight, K. McPherson, A.C. Knipper; Motorcycle rider advancement course development (DOT-HS-805-738); National Public Services Research Institute, (1980), .

<sup>Shappell and Wiegmann, 1997</sup> Shappell and Wiegmann, 1997. Shappell, S.A., Wiegmann, D.A., 1997. A human error approach to accident investigation: the taxonomy of unsafe operations. Int. J. Aviat. Psychol.

<sup>Baker et al., 2001</sup> Baker et al., 2001. S.P. Baker, M.W. Lamb, G. Grabowski, G. Rebok, G. Li; Characteristics of general aviation crashes involving mature male and female pilots; Aviat. Space Environ. Med.; Vol. 72, (2001), pp. 447-452.

<sup>United States Coast Guard, 2004</sup> United States Coast Guard, 2004. United States Coast Guard; Boating Statistics-2004; Office of Boating Safety, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. (2004), .

BARD file, fitting these data to what seemed a logical causal breakdown, based on their previous experience, to create an initial classification consisting of 300 error categories. The categories covered a range of boating activities including advanced preparation for the season, preparation for individual boating occasions, operating safely under normal conditions, accommodating rough weather and limited visibility, occupant protection, and several activities that take place on boats. An "error" was defined as any act whose direct, unintentional contribution to an accident could be reliably determined from information provided in accident reports. Excluded were cases where causes were too remote from the accident in time and distance to be validly inferred from information collected at the accident scene (e.g. operator background, instruction, general health). As noted earlier, the role of such remote factors is better inferred statistically through comparisons of their involvement in accidents with their general presence in boating.

Using a refinement of the initial classification based on the initial experience, an additional 3000 accidents from the 1996 and 1998 files were classified by six experienced boating safety specialists from outside the project staff. Each analyst was assigned 500 cases selected in a manner such that all reviewed what might be considered cross-section of boat types. In accident reports, as noted previously, boats are classified by the Coast Guard into nine categories: auxiliary (motor) sailboats, cabin motorboats, open motorboats, canoes and kayaks, house boats, personal watercraft, pontoon boats, row boats and sail-only boats. Recognizing that open motorboats, cabin motorboats and personal watercraft (PWCs) account for approximately 90% of all accidents, the sample was constructed so as to include all errors in the files for the remaining vessel categories. These made up but one third of the total sample, leaving two-thirds for the three major categories. From what remained, quotas were assigned the three major types in proportion to their share of all accidents reported. The final numbers appear later in the table of errors by boat type.

Up to four errors could be recorded for any accident, no distinction being made as to relative contribution of the different errors to the accident (it either did or did not contribute to the accident). The additional analysis yielded usable 2358 cases, raising the total sample 3358 accidents. The shortfall involved cases in which either the causes were unknown or in which the information provided was insufficient to reveal errors. In analyses carried out under the BARD system, analysts would have the opportunity to follow up with investigators to gain additional information, an option not available in working with historical records. Of the entire sample, one third involved fatalities, all those for which causes could be reliably identified. The remainder were non-fatals. Consideration was given to separate analysis of the two sub-samples since most of the fatalities were drownings whereas the injuries were not. Yet, when the errors leading to the accidents were examined it was clear that they were highly similar.

The final step in the error classification process was to reduce the distribution of the original 300 error categories to a more manageable number using the following procedure. First, the error categories were consolidated by grouping together those errors that are similar enough to be treated in largely the same manner. While such a classification system is often referred to as a "taxonomy", the term connotes an inherent order of things, such as the classification of animal or plant life. Here the classification is used simply as a convenient way of organizing causes into relatively homogeneous categories. Following the initial classification, those errors occurring in less than 2% of accidents for any of the nine boat categories were excluded, thus limiting results to those errors that would be the most worthy targets of preventive efforts. The result of the classification process was 68 categories containing errors considered sufficiently homogeneous with respect to preventive measures to warrant being combined. However, although the frequencies of the full 68 error categories for each boat type are provided in the study final report (McKnight et al., 2004), this paper is limited to the 47 errors occurring at least 5% of the time across all boat categories.

One caution to be borne in mind is that the errors are inferences from the information supplied by state and local boating law enforcement officers investigating accidents. The analysts identifying and coding errors were careful to limit their interpretations to that which could be reasonably well established from the information supplied. One form of error that must be viewed with caution concerns the involvement of alcohol, which is based upon the investigating officer's inference from observed behavior, which often conceals intoxication of a degree that can create risk.

---

McKnight et al., 2004 McKnight et al., 2004. A.J. McKnight, W.W. Becker, A.J. Pettit, A.S. McKnight; Risk Management and Human Error in Recreational Boating, vol. 2: Analysis of human error in recreational boating; Marine Safety Foundation, Farmingdale, NJ (2004), .

Estimates of involvement based upon the odds of death at various levels of blood alcohol for open and cabin motorboats have placed it at twice the level given in accident reports (Smith et al., 2001). However, one might expect alcohol involvement in fatalities to be greater than in a sample two-thirds of which are non-fatals.

### 3 Results

A tabular presentation of errors by boat type appears in Table 1. The total number of accidents analyzed for each type appears at the top. The most noteworthy result is the extent to which errors leading to accidents vary across boat categories. Even those errors that appear in more than one type of boat tend to take different forms for each type. This will become apparent in the following descriptions of errors in each of the boat types.

#### 3.1 Auxiliary sail

Errors involving lack of adequate visual search are the leading causes of accidents involving auxiliaries, as is the case in most transportation accidents. These include failure to keep an eye on boats ahead, primarily arising from diversion of attention to sail handling and other essential tasks, lack of general surveillance, and failing to overcome the vision obstructions caused by the sails and crew. Failure to keep sufficient distance from other boats or fixed structures is a problem often complicated by wind and wave action. Accidents are particularly frequent in crowded anchorages. Another contributor to accidents is cutting close to other boats, often violating right-of-way in order to maintain a desired heading, particularly common in races. Given the wind and sea conditions under which sailboats operate, falls on board and overboard are frequent, particularly when handling sails or otherwise moving about the boat. Falls frequently result from failure to adjust sails and steering for wind gusts, or to shorten sail when necessary. With their deep drafts, auxiliaries are prone to running aground when depth is not frequently checked with depth sounders or use of navigational aids. Auxiliaries are more difficult to maneuver under power than most other motorized vessels and tend to have difficulty docking in windy conditions, often when approaching too fast.

#### 3.2 Cabin motorboats

Failure of cabin motorboat operators to notice things ahead include other boats, anchored or moving, small floating objects or navigational markers. Many times operators are distracted by people or various tasks. The view ahead is often obstructed by passengers on the foredeck or by the foredeck itself when the bow is raised at increased speeds. Alcohol impaired operation of cabin motorboats is among the highest, often resulting in collisions with other boats or fixed objects, causing damage or injury when they occur at high speed. A third major accident contributor involves failing to keep sufficient distance from other boats, including getting too close in normal travel or docking, not reacting properly to an unexpected maneuver, or trying to maneuver through a crowded anchorage. Failing to check water depth, visually or through navigational aids, is as common in motorboats as in sailboats, despite their relatively shallow drafts. Lack of a firm handhold is a common cause of falls overboard and injuries on board as boats traveling at relatively high speeds hit waves or wakes.

Cabin motorboats are heavily represented in accidents caused by excessive speed, including speeding near other boats, creating large wakes near docks, in anchorages, or in narrow passages, and, in some cases, striking other boats. Operating too fast to respond in time to such unlighted objects as anchored boats, buoys, or piers, is also particularly frequent among cabin motorboats. Another speed-related error involves operating too fast in approaching waves and wakes, with the result that the boat is damaged, swamped or capsized, or occupants are bounced about or thrown into the water. Finally, as with other boats dependent on power, inadequate maintenance of engines and operating controls plays a role in accidents.

#### 3.3 Canoes and kayaks

The classification of boats employed in the BARD system at the time of the human error analysis, placed canoes and kayaks in the same category. Canoeing appears to be the more social and kayaks the more athletic of the activities, which shows up in the nature of their accidents. For both boat types, failure to have PFDs, or to wear them in



conditions creating a significant chance of immersion and drowning, are among the highest of all boat categories. Failure to wear them when cold water creates a risk of hypothermia is particularly characteristic of kayakers. Other frequent causes of accidents to both types of vessel are not checking the route ahead for strong currents, waterfalls, dams, or various other obstructions (e.g. logs and stumps), and generally failing to consider the vessel's design relative to its intended use. Neither vessel is designed for rough weather, and lacking the skill needed handle it, or failing to seek shelter when it is encountered, add up to a significant risk. Among canoeists, significant sources of accidents are standing up, playing games, jumping into water deeper than expected and having the canoe blown away, and failing to stay with the overturned canoe. Alcohol is also a major factor in the activities leading to capsizing, as well to getting out of a canoe in water too deep to touch bottom. Canoes and kayaks are particularly vulnerable to rough weather, lack of necessary skills, and failure to seek shelter. Kayakers are particularly inclined to venture out in very cold or rough conditions for which they are not properly clothed or equipped (e.g. helmets).

### 3.4 Houseboats

Low speed maneuvering alongside boats, docks or other structures is a bigger problem for houseboats than for all others combined, largely a consequence of their beam and windage. The problem is further complicated by the frequent failure of inexperienced operators to recognize and develop the handling skills required. The difficulty in maneuvering frequently leads to approaching docks or other boats with too much speed, particularly when confronted by strong wind. The same boat design characteristics make weather a bigger factor for houseboats than for other types, and errors included failure to recognize conditions that call for certain precautions, to respond properly when they are recognized, and to seek shelter soon enough. Houseboats are used for social gathering as much as for transportation. The presence of other passengers often distracts from the operator's attention from the path ahead while position of the helm in most houseboats makes it difficult to see boats approaching from the side. All of these problems are complicated by the use of alcohol, which is a major factor in houseboat accidents. Impairment coupled with the limited maneuverability of houseboats resulted in many collisions with docks and other boats. However, many alcohol-related accidents also involve activities that lead to falls overboard. Houseboats appear to have more trouble anchoring than other boat types. Problems include not having an anchor ready to be dropped quickly when needed (e.g. engine quits) and being blown into other boats or the shore. A similar problem is not paying out enough scope on anchor lines in strong winds.

### 3.5 Open motorboats

Interest in the causes of open motorboat accidents is heightened by their sheer numbers over a third of all accidents reported. Excessive consumption of alcohol is a major contributor to accidents in open motorboats, leading to many of the problems that are to be described. The speed with which open motorboats travel places a premium on keeping a good lookout ahead and around the boat, failure to do so making up the next most common accident contributor. High speed when negotiating waves and boat wakes creates conditions that invite such consequences as capsizing or swamping the boat, losing passengers overboard, and causing injury to passengers inside the boat. The latter two are often the result of occupants failing to have a firm grip or secure footing at all times. Finally, speeding in and around other boats, close to land and various structures on or near land, and failing to reduce speed to the limits of night visibility or in tight quarters are also frequent accident causes, just as they are for cabin motorboats. Maneuvers that threaten stability, including excessively sharp turns, are problems for open motorboats.

Open motorboats share with canoes, kayaks and rowboats incidents that leave occupants in the water, and failure to have passengers wear PFDs where immersion is not an unlikely prospect are significant causes of drowning. Not having PFDs worn in cold weather, where hypothermia is a possibility, or by those who cannot swim is a problem exceeded by not even having them available. Open motorboats are the primary source of water-skiing accidents, including those resulting from the way the boat is operated when towing skiers and or from unsafe recovery efforts, including running into the skiers. Like other boats dependent on power, poor maintenance of the engines or their controls leads to erratic operation and frequently to accidents.

### 3.6 Personal watercraft

With the highest of all per-boat accident rates, PWCs are a worthy object of attention in the search for accident causes. The inclination of operators to travel in close proximity to other vessels shows up in a large number of

collisions. PWCs frequently travel in tight groups, with one making a sudden turn into another, attempting to pass as the one that is starting to turn, or traveling close behind when the one ahead stops suddenly. Under these conditions, operators spend considerable time looking at one another rather than ahead, increasing the chances of collisions with boats and objects in the path ahead. Many collisions in close quarters occurred in playing games, such as trying to spray one another or occupants of nearby boats. About a fourth of PWC accidents took place while jumping waves or wakes, with injuries resulting from collisions with other boats or from hitting the water. Operating too close to land also leads to collisions with docks, piers, riprap, trees and branches.

PWCs are frequently operated by people having little or no experience with boats of any kind and who lack sufficient knowledge or skill to handle the vessel safely. Many are first time rentals. Accidents of inexperience involve making excessively sharp turns, cutting power and being unable to steer, or simply moving too fast in tight quarters. Ignorance of right-of-way regulations, and failing to yield in collision situations are significant accident contributors. Alcohol plays a very small role in PWC accidents.

### 3.7 Pontoon boats

Like houseboats and PWCs, pontoon boats are often operated by people with little previous experience with boats of any type. The designs of pontoon boats, along with the environment in which they operate, have an obvious influence upon the nature of accidents and the errors contributing to them. Most are open platforms for fishing, swimming and social activities leading to falls onboard and overboard. Most could have been prevented by assuring a firm grip and good footing when standing or moving about, or simply by remaining seated in rough water. Falls overboard often come from bow riding (particularly with the gate open), playing games, leaving children unsupervised, and leaning over the side or bow (e.g. retrieving anchors). Failure of operators to look ahead and all around the boat, or to the side before turns appears to result primarily from distraction, interacting with passengers or preparing for various activities, such as fishing. Instances of failure to keep enough distance from other boats tend to arise under two general conditions: (1) when traveling alongside or stopping in the company of other boat and (2) when having to maneuver in close quarters during docking. All of the preceding errors involve acts that can be affected by alcohol, the consumption of which occurs as part of the social activity that often takes place continuously.

Not leaving enough distance from land and structures such as docks tended to occur in low visibility and when distracting activities are taking place on board. Checking the depth of the water is particularly important given the shallow waters in which pontoon boats operate. Operators may have been lulled into thinking the shallow draft of pontoon boats exempt them from grounding. Accidents involving rough weather are relatively infrequent in a vessel intended primarily for use in quiet waters. The risk of immersion and need for PFDs arises less from weather conditions than from on-board activities close to the water, such as doing repairs, or children playing near the edge of the boat.

### 3.8 Rowboats

Rowboats exceed all other boat types in failure to have required numbers and types of PFDs aboard, and equal canoes in failure to put them on under risk of immersion. Such conditions include rough seas, the boat filling with water, danger of capsizing, swift current, particularly near rocks, ledges or low head dams, overloading, carrying out dangerous maneuvers, working over the side (e.g. pulling pots), passengers engaged in horseplay, and the inability to swim. Another problem is failure to wear PFDs when cold temperatures threaten survival in the water. For passengers in the water, attempting to swim ashore rather than remain with the floating boat leads to fatalities, as is the case in canoes. All told, failure to have or use flotation devices accounts for more than a third of fatalities. Acts leading directly to immersion include overloading the boat, poor distribution of weight, particularly when stepping into the boat, not remaining seated, and not having a good grip when leaning over the side or standing up, or when the boat was subject to severe roll. Attempting to use rowboats in strong currents, such as in rapids and near low head dams leads to capsizing and swamping. Setting out in rough weather is also a contributor to accidents typically resulting in immersion, a case of using a boat simply unsuitable for prevailing conditions.

Because of the low speed with which they generally travel, rowboats seldom have problems with seeing far enough ahead. However, a significant number of accidents do occur when the boat is under power (usually outboards), or



when the rower is looking behind and moving in fast current or being rowed fast (e.g. racing shell). Making abrupt turns under power often result in capsizing. As a source of accidents due to drinking, rowboats are up with the leaders. Much of it occurs when the boat is being used for fishing or hunting and drinking goes on continuously. On other occasions the drinking takes place at a bar or on some other boat, and the accident occurs when returning. As with canoes and pontoon boats, the damage done by drinking is primarily to the drinkers themselves, who frequently fall off, capsize or swamp their boats.

Inflatables were not included in the analysis of errors because of their relatively small number of accidents at the time the analysis took place. They are similar to rowboats in that about a third of accidents involve falls overboard, far exceeding the proportion for any other boat type. However, they differ in that rowboats have four times the number of fatalities but only about half the injuries. The higher fatality rate of rowboats is due to the greater tendency to capsize, whereas the higher injury rate of inflatables results from higher speeds and collisions with fixed objects.

### 3.9 Sailboats

It is not surprising that problems in sail handling would be a leading contributor to accidents for boats depending upon sails for propulsion. Such problems include failing to shorten or drop sail in excessive wind and not spilling the wind in gusts. Most of the time the result of such shortcomings was capsizing, although in some cases injury occurred from contact with some part of the boat, such as the boom. There are also a few instances with smaller boats where sailors fail to recognize the severity of the weather and should avoid attempting to sail at all.

Accidents due to improper lookout are similar to those experienced with auxiliaries. Failure to look ahead involves not paying enough attention to what was going on and running into other boats or, in some cases, fixed objects such as buoys. Failure to exercise all-round surveillance becomes a problem mainly when boats are on intersecting paths, often where the approach of another boat is obscured by the sail. There are also some cases when the intersecting boat is seen, but the skipper on the port tack misjudges clearance. Related to these accidents are those in which the boat is sailed close to other boats or other structures (e.g. docks) without allowing for wind changes and momentary loss of control. Some of these situations occur at the start of races where space is at a premium and collisions are not uncommon. Failure to wear a PFD under recognized risk of immersion, primarily high winds, leads to many instances of drowning. Leaks most often occur in catamaran pontoons, but are also found in monohulls where holes in the hull are overlooked or the when the crew fails to insert plugs. Sailing is an activity that requires a relatively high degree of skill and knowledge, and the decision to tackle challenging conditions without having both is a significant cause of accidents. Little drinking goes on under sail, but in a few instances the effects of alcohol appear to play a role in poor handling of conditions.

## 4 Discussion

The most significant finding in the analysis described is the extent to which the errors leading to recreational boating accidents vary from one category of boat to another. The differences in category of error, as shown in Table 1, are further varied by specific characteristics of boats. For example, the descriptions given in Section 3 show that failure to "look for obstructions in the path ahead" for auxiliary sailboats arises from vision obstructions caused by crew while in cabin motorboats it is passengers on the foredeck and the raised bow itself. Few attempts to improve boating safety attempt to take account of the large differences across boat types in the errors that occur and the effect they have upon safety. Most present safety courses prescribe safety measures that apply across boating in general. A reasonable approach in preparing boaters to handle the specific problems they will encounter in the type of boat they will be operating would be to augment general boating safety courses with segments focusing upon the dominant errors of individual boat types. As noted earlier, inferences as to human error leading to accidents based upon the reports of investigators are themselves subject to error. However, this is true of any inferences as to cause drawn from other than controlled experimentation. The frequencies of errors described in this paper were those prevailing over the period in which they were recorded. They may change over time in responses to changes in the hazards presented to boaters and their ability to handle them. The U.S. Coast Guard has added the 68 errors targeted by the analysis to its boating accident report database, allowing changes in the frequency of various errors to be considered in various prevention measures.

## Acknowledgements

This project was performed under a grant awarded to the Marine Safety Foundation from the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund, administered by the U.S. Coast Guard Office of ***Boating*** Safety. Phillip Cappel served as grant monitor while Bruce Schmidt supervised the ***Boating Accident*** Reporting Data Base (BARD). The ***Boating Accident*** Investigation, Reporting and Analysis Committee of the National Association of State ***Boating*** Law Administrators participated in several aspects of the research, particularly carrying out the pilot study.

## TABLES

Table 1

Activity in which error occurred	Aux. sail (202)	Cabin motor (408)	Canoe kayak (291)	House boat (132)	Open motor (1176)	PWC Pont. boat (612) (161)	Row boat (128)	Sail only (148)
Assure <i>boat</i> suitability for conditions			5				6	
Maintain engine properly	3	4		6	2			
Maintain engine controls properly		4		4	3			
Check hull for leaks							2	5
Check fuel lines, handle fuel safely				6				
Check route for current/obstructions			10		2			
Possess skill for handling vessel			2	11		4 3		
Possess skill for conditions			7					3
Assure availability of PFDs			8		2		16	
PFD use under immersion risk			17		8	4	15	5
PFD use under hypothermia risk			6		2		5	
PFD use by non-swimmers			5		2		3	
Limit consumption of alcohol	3	11	15	10	15	5 12	15	3
Load vessel relative to capacity					3		11	
Occupants/load distributed safely							5	
Check/recognize weather conditions				5			4	4
Avoiding unsafe weather condition			8		2	3	5	8
Maneuver safely in tight quarters	3	2		18		4		
Safe speeds in tight quarters	3			9	2	2		
Maintain enough power for steering						5		
Avoid excessively					2	4	4	

## Human error in recreational boating; (2006) 39 ESACAP 2 398-405

Activity in which error occurred	Aux. sail (202)	Cabin motor (408)	Canoe kayak (291)	House boat (132)	Open motor (1176)	PWC Pont. (612) boat (161)	Row boat (128)	Sail only (148)
sharp turns								
Steer and trim sail for balance	6							
Operate safely in strong current			14				7	
Respond safely to rough conditions			5	4				4
Seek shelter in rough conditions			5	3				
Refrain from wave jumping						8		
Exercise all around surveillance	6	4		3	4	8		
Look for obstructions in path ahead	19	15		5	14	23 12	6	10
Look around before turning						10 3		
Visually check depth regularly	4	5			4	6		
Overcome vision obstructions	5					3		12
Limit speed in tight quarters								
Reduce speed at night/low visibility		5			3			
Reduce speed in waves/wakes		3			6	7		
Reduce speed near other <u>boats</u>		5			3	16		
Keep distance from other <u>boats</u>	11	10	2		7	35 8		5
Keep distance from land/structures	5	4		2	3	4 3	2	3
Avoid acts reducing vessel stability			9		4		12	
Use navigation aids to avoid danger	4	6						
Yield legal right-of-way	4					3		3
Give way in risk of collision						6		
Keep firm grip to avoid falls	6	6		2	8	16	8	3
Adjust sail/steering for wind gusts	3							7
Shorten sail when necessary	4							12
Stay in secure position on <u>boat</u>						6		
Operate safely with skiers					7			
Recover skiers/					5	3		

Activity in which error occurred	Aux. sail (202)	Cabin motor (408)	Canoe kayak (291)	House <u>boat</u> (132)	Open motor (1176)	PWC (612) <u>boat</u> (161)	Pont. <u>boat</u> (128)	Row <u>boat</u> (148)	Sail only
swimmers safely									
Use proper anchor type and scope				6		3			
Safe action if capsized or swamped			4				6		

Percent error by boat type (for errors totaling 5% or more across types)

CONTACT: \* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 410 263 6839.

## References

---

Treat et al., 1977 Treat et al., 1977. J.R. Treat, N.S. Tumbas, S.T. McDonald, D. Shinar, R.D. Hume, R.E. Mayer, R.L. Stansifer, N.J. Castellan; Tri-level Study of the Causes of Traffic Accidents, vol. I: Causal Factor Tabulations and Assessments, vol. II: Special Analyses; Government Printing Office (Indiana University, Institute for Research in Public Safety), Washington, DC (1977), .

Smith et al., 2001 Smith et al., 2001. G.S. Smith, P.M. Keyl, J.A. Hadley, C.I. Bartley, R.D. Foss, W.G. Tolbert, J. McKnight; Drinking and recreational boating fatalities: a population-based case-control study; JAMA; Vol. 286, No. 23; (2001), .

Reason, 1990 Reason, 1990. J. Reason; Human Error; Cambridge University Press, New York (1990), .

McKnight and McKnight, 2003 McKnight and McKnight, 2003. A.J. McKnight, A.S. McKnight; Young novice drivers: careless or clueless; Accident Anal. Prev.; Vol. 35, No. 6; (2003), pp. 921-926.

Hurt et al., 1981 Hurt et al., 1981. Hurt Jr., H.H., Ouellet, J.V., Thom, D.R., 1981. Motorcycle accident cause factors and identification of countermeasures, vol. I. Technical Report. Traffic Safety Center, University of Southern California, DOT-HS 805 862, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

McKnight et al., 1980 McKnight et al., 1980. A.J. McKnight, K. McPherson, A.C. Knipper; Motorcycle rider advancement course development (DOT-HS-805-738); National Public Services Research Institute, (1980), .

Shappell and Wiegmann, 1997 Shappell and Wiegmann, 1997. Shappell, S.A., Wiegmann, D.A., 1997. A human error approach to accident investigation: the taxonomy of unsafe operations. Int. J. Aviat. Psychol.

Baker et al., 2001 Baker et al., 2001. S.P. Baker, M.W. Lamb, G. Grabowski, G. Rebok, G. Li; Characteristics of general aviation crashes involving mature male and female pilots; Aviat. Space Environ. Med.; Vol. 72, (2001), pp. 447-452.

United States Coast Guard, 2004 United States Coast Guard, 2004. United States Coast Guard; Boating Statistics-2004; Office of Boating Safety, United States Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. (2004), .

McKnight et al., 2004 McKnight et al., 2004. A.J. McKnight, W.W. Becker, A.J. Pettit, A.S. McKnight; Risk Management and Human Error in Recreational Boating, vol. 2: Analysis of human error in recreational boating; Marine Safety Foundation, Farmingdale, NJ (2004), .

## Classification

---

**Language:** ENGLISH

**Document Type:** Full-length article

**Publication Type:** Other (Journal)

**Journal Code:** AAP

**Subject:** BOATING & RAFTING (92%); COASTAL AREAS (90%); US FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (90%); INVESTIGATIONS (89%); MARINE TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENTS (78%); TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS (77%); MARINE PASSENGER TRANSPORT (77%); AIRLINES (69%); COMMERCIAL & GENERAL AVIATION AIRCRAFT (62%); Recreational boating safety; Error frequency in boating accidents

**Organization:** US COAST GUARD (93%)

**Geographic:** UNITED STATES (93%)

**Load-Date:** April 27, 2007

Accident Analysis & Prevention

Copyright 2006 Elsevier Ltd All Rights Reserved