

MINUTES

HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

10:00 a.m., Thursday, February 13, 1997

Port of San Francisco, Ferry Building, Room 3100, San Francisco, CA

1. The public meeting was called to order by A. Thomas, Chair at 10:15. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: Dave Adams, Port of Oakland; Charles Mitchell, Port of San Francisco; Eugene Serex (alternate for Ronald Kennedy), Port of Richmond; Margo Brown, National Boating Federation; Maurice Croce, Chevron Shipping Company; Stuart McRobbie, SeaRiver Maritime; Lynn Korwatch (alternate for John Gosling), Matson Navigation; Scott Merritt, Foss Maritime; Gail Skarich (alternate for Mary McMillan), Sanders Towboat Company; Arthur Thomas, San Francisco Bar Pilots; Joan Lundstrom, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; and Roger Peters, Member at Large; U. S. Coast Guard representatives, Capt. D. P. Montoro and Lt. Cmdr. Rob Lorrigan (MSO) and Commander Chip Sharpe, 11th Coast Guard District; and OSPR representative, Bud Leland. Also in attendance, more than thirty-five representatives of the interested public.
2. Minutes of the 1-9-97 meeting were corrected as follows: Per J. Lundstrom, on p. 4, Rich Smith is a member of the Bridge Management/Small Boat Sub-Committee. MOTION by M. Brown, seconded by M. Croce, "to approve the minutes of 1-9-97 as corrected." Motion passed without objection.
3. The Chair noted that the recent heavy rains had resulted in the closing of the Ports of Sacramento and Stockton to deep draft ships. The ports are now open, with some channel restrictions.
4. **COAST GUARD COTP'S REPORT**, Capt. D. P. Montoro. (1) Written reports of pollution statistics for the period 1-1-97 to 1-31-97 and significant port safety events for the period 1-8-97 to 2-10-97 are made a part of these minutes. There was nothing significant in terms of spills during the period. There were two SOLAS interventions, one propulsion casualty and one allision of a vessel with a crane at the Port of Oakland that resulted in considerable damage to the crane. D. Montoro reviewed the elements of the intervention process and briefly discussed causes for determining which vessels to board. In response to a question regarding a lack of fluency in English and the inability for crewmembers to communicate with one another and/or the pilot, D. Montoro responded that the pilot or any other individual can report communication problems to MSO. This can trigger USCG attention and intervention. The U.S. is in the process of adopting the I.M.O. Standards in Training and Crew Watchkeeping. However, under these standards, the vessel must have had an accident or the Coast Guard must demonstrate cause, before it can be boarded. In response to a question regarding the status of the Uninspected Towing Vessel Program, D. Montoro responded that the program is voluntary, subject to involuntary boarding. Under the program, a minimum of one vessel per month must be inspected. To date Foss and SeaRiver have each had a vessel inspected and both were top-notch. (2) The biggest source of concern has been the significant shoaling where the San Joaquin River meets the deep water channel. The COE is surveying the area and dredging is underway.

5. **OSPR REPORT**, B. Leland. (1) Pilotage. OSPR is participating in the States/BC Task Force pilotage evaluation work group. The task force has representatives from all facets of the maritime community from Alaska, California, Oregon, Washington and British Columbia. The focus is to coordinate spill response efforts and prevention programs. The pilotage evaluation report is due to be completed this summer. (2) The State of California, Coast Guard and California ports outside the SF Bay Area are ready to sign a Memorandum of Understanding that provides a requirement that a pilot is mandated on all tankers. The agreement covers the ports of Humbolt, LA/LB and San Diego. The target date for full execution is 2-28-97. There has been media focus on the MOU and the fact that it does not apply to the SF Bay Area. It is OSPR's opinion that the Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo and Suisun is currently providing the responsibility contained in the MOU and should be retained. The OSPR report will be out this year. (3) OSPR contacted the Office of the Governor after reports of a Governor's Office investigation of state pilots and the Pilot Commission was reported by the media. There is no investigation of the Bay Area pilot system underway at the Governor's Office.

(4) In connection with PORTS, a new ad hoc committee was launched last week to oversee the transition from a NOAA run program to a public partnership. There will be a two year evaluation period, during which time the value of PORTS will be determined, who uses it and what are they getting out of it. In addition, OSPR has pledged ½ of the funding to maintain PORTS after the transition in October. The committee will look to sources for the balance of the funding. At the end of the transition period, OSPR will want NOAA to certify that the system is accurate and reliable enough to meet NOAA standards.

(5) There are two out-standing implementation issues in connection with tank vessel escorting. They should be handled by mid-March. The first is crew training programs. OSPR has contracted with CMA and is working with the Golden Gate Towboat Association to develop standards. Barbara Foster of Sacramento has been assigned to the project. The second issue is the review of methods of alternative compliance. OSPR is looking to contract with a naval architect or marine engineer to do peer review of the plans submitted. At this time interim approval is being given to some plans. Question: Regarding the chart that relates displacement tonnage and current to the required kips; if a ship falls in between two categories, can a linear extrapolation be used to arrive at the necessary kips? B. Leland responded no, the kips purchased must be within the range as shown on the chart. Question: In the future, will OSPR speak to designing a chart for displacement and current to allow for interpolation. B. Leland responded that OSPR is looking to do that. The regulations will need to be changed and the process would take two years. The chair added that this could require going back to the contractor, Glosten Associates, to re-do the calculations. Question: In zone 6, the current numbers come from a point at the Carquinez Bridge. In the scenario where a ship goes to anchorage 23 and then moves to Shell, Exxon or Amorco, that ship has to use Carquinez Bridge current predictions, which are one knot different than the actuals. Why was that particular point picked as the only one for zone 6? B. Leland responded that OSPR determined that most movements in that area are through or close to the Carquinez Bridge. They tried not to complicate planning calculations by not putting in more points. In terms of accuracy, OSPR knew that those tables weren't 100% accurate, but they are the best known source of predictions available. PORTS will fix this in the future.

6. CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT, A. Steinbrugge. (1) The Clearinghouse report for the month of January is made a part of these minutes. Numbers have been added for non-escorted barges. (2) There were seven occasions where escorts did check in with the Clearing House since the last HSC meeting and in all but one instance where a tug with a loaded barge departed anchorage without reporting in (the escort tug did report), all cases involved vessels or tug and barges that did not require an escort neglecting to check in. These occurrences should be significantly reduced when operators become more familiar with the new requirements. OSPR calls the responsible party to notify them each time there is a reporting violation. Question: Have there been any problems with the pre-planning conference. A. Steinbrugge responded no. A. Thomas added that the pilots board outbound vessels that require an escort ½ hour early to complete the conference before the transit. Inbound vessels are boarded beyond the pilot station.

7. PORTS STEERING COMMITTEE, D. Adams. (1) PORTS experienced several malfunctions and disruptions recently, due to the weather and vessels squatting on doplar devices. (2) The ad hoc committee referred to in the OSPR report is not an appendage of the HSC. It has been established to monitor and evaluate the demonstration project and develop an understanding of user and hardware needs. Kenneth O'Laughlin, SFBP, reported on an occasion last week with a Maersk vessel ran into complications loading cargo. The ship was going to miss its window for sailing. With PORTS information, the vessel was able to sail. This allowed her to load additional containers and also avoid the charges that would have been incurred if the vessel were held in port. D. Adams noted that it is these instances of demonstrated advantages that the ad hoc committee needs to know about.

8. UNDERWATER ROCK REMOVAL COMMITTEE, J. Lundstrom. (1) At the request of Jeff Chatfield, U. S. Army COE, a sub-committee meeting was held at the Pier 9 pilot station on 1-22-97. More than twenty people attended, representing a broad range of interests. J. Chatfield reported that there is no money available to go forward with the reconnaissance study planned to look at the composition of the rocks and costs for removal/lowering. In the meantime, Representative George Miller has drafted federal legislation that would provide for lowering the rocks and shoaling at Alcatraz, using one of the alternatives included in the Underwater Rock Removal Sub-Committee's report of April, 1996. His interest was sparked by the recent CAPE MOHICAN spill which involved only 8400 gallons of oil, but has already cost \$10 million to clean up. John Lawrence was in attendance at the meeting, representing Rep. Miller and the House Resources Committee. Rep. Miller believes that it is better to look at prevention than response because of the high cost of clean-up. The draft legislation was distributed at the 1-22 meeting. At that time, members of the sub-committee emphasized that the HSC has gone on record in support of lowering the rocks, but as yet the committee had not pinpointed the method for doing this, pending the proposed study by the COE. This study has been stymied. Federal money is tight and Rep. Miller is looking for local cost sharing. The sub-committee responded that, because of the nature of the bay, there are many ports and users. One suggestion was that, if Rep. Miller is interested, perhaps he could get the COE reconnaissance study started. Miller's office suggested OSPR fund this study, emphasizing the hazard to navigation for deep draft ships. J. Lawrence will return to the Bay Area with additional information. J. Lundstrom reported on a letter just received from Rep. Miller, which includes the current draft language for the bill. She will make this

available to anyone upon request. The bill is currently serving as a place-holder. Rep. Miller will be looking to the HSC for further input.

9. Question: How is the HSC going to respond to Rep. Miller's request as a committee of the whole or as individual agencies? D. Montoro noted that, while he supports the lowering of the rocks, he has a problem with some of the premises. J. Lundstrom responded that the HSC, at the last meeting, agreed that individuals would respond. HSC response would be limited to reiterating the past stance. The HSC would like to be included in the process. Individuals should copy their responses to the Underwater Rock Removal Sub-Committee, for the information of the HSC and for the record. Given these facts, does the HSC want to assign the Rock Removal Sub-Committee to respond to Rep. Miller's request or have individual members respond independently? The chair suggested that someone from J. Lawrence's office attend the next scheduled HSC meeting and report. Question: What are the unknowns with respect to the rock lowering project? J. Lundstrom responded that the unknowns include the exact composition of the rocks and additional profiling of the rocks is needed (NOS has fine-tuned the profile). In addition, various engineering methods and related costs must be looked at, as well as whether the debris can be left in place or must be taken out of the bay. Many of these considerations will be predicated on environmental impacts. It is noted that federal law may have to be changed to allow the COE to address the value of prevention in computing the benefits of a project. Currently, they must use an increase in speed or traffic, with economic benefits. J. Lundstrom reported that there is an on-going project in Hawaii where the COE is being allowed to take safety into consideration.

10. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

11. **NEW BUSINESS:** (1) D. Montoro reported that Adm. Card will be chairing a town hall style meeting at the Federal Building in Oakland on 2-28-97 to address "Prevention through People." D. Montoro will confirm date and time and provide to the MX for distribution. "Prevention through People" is a Coast Guard program that recognizes the human element in the occurrence and prevention of casualties. The chair noted that the HSC, at its last meeting, agreed to bring aboard NTSB and others in this regard. The Bay Area is one of the hubs of studies of the human element and there are several experts in the field locally. (2) Fred Gadsick, State Lands, announced that a State Lands customer service meeting is scheduled for CMA on 2-26-97. (3) The chair welcomed the pilot trainees in attendance.

12. The next meeting is scheduled for 3-13-97 at the Port of Richmond Harbormaster's Office.

13. MOTION by J. Lundstrom, seconded by M. Croce, "to adjourn the meeting." Meeting adjourned at 11:15 without objection.

Submitted by:

Terry Hunter
Executive Secretary

SIGNIFICANT PORT SAFETY EVENTS

FOR PERIOD January 8, 1997 to February 10, 1997

1. Total Port Safety cases open for period: 31
Cases include:
 - SIV Arrival/Departures
 - Bridge Casualties
2. SOLAS Interventions: 2
3. Number of vessels requesting/granted Letters of Deviation to enter Bay: 5/5
Cases include:
 - Inop Radar (4)
 - Inop Gyro (1)
4. Propulsion/Steering Casualties: 3/0
5. Allisions: 1
6. Groundings: 2

Significant Cases:

GENERAL INCIDENT - With input from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Commander Eleventh Coast Guard District rescinded on January 14th a Special Local Regulation closing the Sacramento Deep Water Channel. The COTP imposed restrictions for daylight transits only and then only within two hours of mean low water. The San Joaquin channel, under the control of the COTP, was opened under the same restrictions. Traffic to the Port of Stockton remains limited by draft due to shoaling.

GROUNDING/SHOALING - On Tuesday January 28th, the bulk freighter AKTEA (Cyprus) was departing berth 12 at the Port of Stockton loaded with sulfur. At approximately 1050 the vessel grounded near light 48 at the confluence of the San Joaquin River and the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. The vessel was refloated and returned to berth under its own power with tug assistance. AKTEA currently remains in Stockton until Corps of Engineers dredging operations reestablish the regulation depth in the channel.

The cause of the shoaling was due to abnormally high sediment deposits from increased flood water flows. The normal working depth for that part of the channel is 35 feet at MLLW and shoaling may have reduced the operating depth to 28-30 feet in some places. The vessel had a draft of 34½ feet. On February 3rd, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers started contract dredging of the channel to 40 feet at the confluence of the San Joaquin and Stockton Channel. The project is expected to last through February 16th. The M/V AKTEA is still delayed at the Port of Stockton until the dredging allows its departure. The Coast Guard has placed no restrictions on vessel movements as the pilots and the Port of Stockton have mutually agreed to limit drafts to 28' plus/minus tide and, as much as possible, conduct transits only during daylight hours.

LOSS OF POWER/GROUNDING - On Friday January 31st at approximately 0110, Vessel Traffic notified the MSO that the bulk freighter PACIFIC SUCCESS (Panama) ran aground in New York Slough after getting underway from USX Dock in Pittsburg. After departing the berth the vessel lost power when the pilot ordered a backing bell. Investigations revealed that the casualty was due to a loose self-locking nut on a reversing air cylinder for the M/E no. 6 cylinder. Within two hours, the vessel regained power and freed itself with the assistance of two tugs. A COTP order was issued to the vessel to survey for damage, make permanent

repairs and test repairs. The engine was repaired and a diver's survey revealed no damage to the vessel. The vessel was allowed to depart the same day.

ALLISION - On Friday February 7th at approximately 1500, the container ship CALIFORNIA ORION (Panama, 32,654 GT, LOA 746') allided with the berth 23 gantry crane on its approach to Yusen terminal in the Port of Oakland. The MSO dispatched vessel inspectors and investigators. Damage to the vessel was minor. The crane was significantly damaged, requiring it to be shored up and stabilized. It is expected to remain out of service for approximately 30 days. A small hydraulic oil spill from the crane was contained and cleaned up. The cause of the incident is under investigation.

POLLUTION STATISTICS

FOR PERIOD 01JAN97 - 31JAN97

	MSO	MSD	TOTAL
1.) Total reported/investigated pollution incidents within MSO SF BAY AOR:	<u>28</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>33</u>
Civil Penalty Action	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>
Spill, No Source	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>
Spill, No Action Taken	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
No Spill, Potential Only	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
No Spill, Unconfirmed Report	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
EPA Zone Reports	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
2.) Discharges of Oil from:			
Deep Draft Vessels	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Oil Transfer Facilities	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Military Vessels/Facilities	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
3.) Federalized Cleanups	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
4.) Non-Federal Cleanups	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>
5.) Hazardous Material Releases	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
6.) Cases requiring polreps	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
7.) Tickets Issued	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>

Significant Cases:

OVERPACK DRUM RETRIEVED BY STATION GOLDEN GATE - ON 27JAN97 A 55 GALLON OVERPACK DRUM WAS RETRIEVED BY STATION GOLDEN GATE. A HAZCAT WAS CONDUCTED ON THE DRUM AND IT WAS FOUND TO BE ACETIC ACID SOLUTION WITH A PH OF 1. THE DRUM WAS TRANSPORTED TO A HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL SITE BY ALLWASTE TRANSPORTATION AND REMEDIATION. THERE WERE NO INJURIES DURING THIS INCIDENT. CERCLA FPN C70042.

UNNAMED CRANE BARGE - ON 07JAN97 THE CRANE BARGE SUNK AT ITS MOORINGS IN MORMON SLOUGH DISCHARGING APPROXIMATELY 50 GALLONS OF DIESEL. SEVERAL 55 GALLON DRUMS OF HAZARDOUS AND OVER 100 1 GALLON CONTAINERS OF HAZARDOUS MATERIAL WERE REMOVED FROM THE CRANE BARGE BY ALLWASTE. THE BARGE WAS RAISED BY SMITH ENVIRONMENTAL. FPN 117009 AND CERCLA FPN C70036.

RAILROAD TANK CAR - ON 28JAN97 MSD PERSONNEL DISCOVERED A FLOATING RAILROAD TANK CAR TIED UP TO ALL MARINE SERVICES PIER IN VALLEJO. IT CORP WAS HIRED TO CONDUCT A HAZCAT AND REMOVAL. CERCLA FPN C70047.

San Francisco Bay Clearinghouse Report For January 1997

San Francisco Bay Region Totals

Tanker arrivals to San Francisco Bay	58
Total tank ship & tank barge movements	329
Tank ship movements	212
Escorted tank ship movements	95
Unescorted tank ship movements	117
Tank barge movements	115
Escorted tank barge movements	58
Unescorted tank barge movements	57

Percentages above are percent of total tank ship & tank barge movements for each item.

Movements by Zone	Zone 1	%	Zone 2	%	Zone 4	%	Zone 6	%	Total	%
Total movements	174		252		0		144		570	
Unescorted movements	76	43.68%	109	43.25%	0	0.00%	67	46.53%	252	44.21%
Tank ships	58	33.33%	58	23.02%	0	0.00%	40	27.78%	156	27.37%
Tank barges	18	10.34%	51	20.24%		0.00%	27	18.75%	96	16.84%
Escorted movements	98	56.32%	143	56.75%	0	0.00%	77	53.47%	318	55.79%
Tank ships	62	35.63%	89	35.32%	0	0.00%	46	31.94%	197	34.56%
Tank barges	36	20.69%	54	21.43%	0	0.00%	31	21.53%	121	21.23%

Notes:

1. Information is only noted for zones where escorts are required.
2. All percentages are percent of total movements for the zone.
3. Every movement is counted in each zone transited during the movement.
4. Total movements is the total of all unescorted movements and all escorted movements.