



5050
3 Jun 2011

MEMORANDUM

From: W. J. Hawn, ENS

Reply to ENS Hawn
Attn of: 399-7442

To: D.A. Janszen, LCDR

Subj: VISIBILITY SENSORS MEETING MINUTES

1. The following comments/questions were recorded during the visibility sensors meeting held in room 107 at Sector San Francisco on 3 June, 2011. The 52-page PowerPoint that was presented by LCDR DesaRae Janszen and Mr. Richard Lopez is available upon request, and may be posted on the Marine Exchange website.
2. Mr. Bob Chedsey brought up a question about overlap capabilities given the location of a sensor and the shipping lanes. The question was posed regarding the information from slide 14. The similarity between airport sensors and the proposed sensors were also discussed where Mr. Mark Strobin provided amplifying information regarding the sensors in use at the airports.
3. Mr. Gerry Wheaton and Mr. Alan Steinbrugge requested information regarding the cost (in labor hours, consumables, replacement parts) for the maintenance of a single unit. Maintenance schedules and quarterly/annual costs were discussed briefly.
4. Mr. Bob Chedsey requested information about how many fog sensors were operational in the SF Bay at present. Mr. Lopez explained that three CG owned fog detectors which serve as Aids-to-Navigation Fog Horn triggers are in operation. There is no connectivity. It would be extremely difficult to pursue connectivity due to the remoteness of the sites. Locations are Point Bonita, Alcatraz and Point Blunt (Angel Island).
5. Mr. Bruce Horton questioned the capabilities of the proposed technology given the description of the technology and the unique fog patterns present in the SF Bay. He requested more in-depth information of the reliability and functionality of the proposed sensors.
6. Mr. Mark Strobin brought up a question regarding the location of the sensors which will provide the most relevant information to decision makers (geographic location with particular interest in the elevation of the sensors).
7. Mr. Gerry Wheaton questioned whether the nine proposed sites are still relevant. He requested that the Fog Sensor Technical Representative from NOAA conduct an official site survey. Ms. Heather Kerkering questioned the need for a sensor in the proposed location at Redwood Creek.
8. Ms. Heather Kerkering brought up a question regarding who exactly this new technology will benefit and how.
9. Ms. Heather Kerkering wanted to know who is/has funded the sensors that were being tested at other ports.

10. Mr. Bruce Horton stated that he did not feel comfortable codifying the requirements for a .5 mile visibility restriction based on a single sensor due to the variations present in the SF Bay area. He expressed interest in the project if it were used as a tool but not interested in the project if it were to support additional regulation.

11. Mr. Bruce Horton, Ms. Heather Kerkering, and Gerry Wheaton recommended that the project move forward without codification and that additional source of funding must be explored.

12. Conclusions:

a. The workgroups are hesitant to endorse creating an additional regulation to make the .5 mile low visibility best practice a law.

b. The workgroups are not convinced that the fog sensors would provide correct visibility data in San Francisco Bay because of the nature of SF fog. They don't want to have vessels restricted to a dock because of a fog sensor reading in one portion of a CMA when the on scene mariner in a different portion of the CMA reports better visibility.

c. Mr. Gerry Wheaton and Mr. John Schneider requested that more members of industry (ferries, tugs, t-boats, etc.) attend a future meeting about this topic along with a fog sensor technical representative.

d. LCDR Janszen recommended that the issue be tabled until September when the fog sensor technical representative from NOAA is available.

#

Enclosures: (1) Attendance Record