

## MINUTES

### HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

10:00 a.m., Thursday, February 8, 2001

Port of San Francisco, Commissioners' Room, Ferry Building, San Francisco, CA

**Grant Stewart**, American Ship Management, Chair, called the public meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and welcomed those in attendance. The secretariat confirmed the presence of a quorum. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: **Gary Hallin**, Port of Oakland; **Tom Wilson** (alternate for Ronald Kennedy), Port of Richmond; **John Davey**, Port of San Francisco; **Brian Dorsch**, Chevron Shipping Company; **Todd Covini** (alternate for Stuart McRobbie), SeaRiver Maritime; **Don Watters**, CSX Lines; **Richard Smith**, Westar Marine Services; **Larry Teague**, San Francisco Bar Pilots, **Michael Beatie**, Golden Gate Ferries; **Margot Brown**, National Boating Federation; and **Joan Lundstrom**, Bay Conservation and Development Commission. U. S. Coast Guard representatives **Capt. Larry Hereth** (MSO) and **Cmdr. Dave Kranking** (VTS); NOAA representative, **Michael Gallagher**; U. S. Army Corps of Engineers representative, **David Dwinell**; State Lands representative, **Ted Mar** and OSPR representative, **Al Storm**. Also in attendance, more than thirty representatives of the interested public.

The Chair welcomed those in attendance and the Secretariat confirmed the presence of a quorum.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of the 1-11-01 meeting. **L. Teague**, p. 4, Navigation Work Group report (1), should read “. . .the electronic transmission of data . . . “ **T. Covini**, p. 7, three references to Zone 6, should all be Zone 5.” MOTION by **M. Brown**, seconded by **J. Davey** “to approve the minutes of the 1-11-01 meeting as corrected.” Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair advised the committee that Port of Richmond representative **R. Kennedy** has retired and resigned from the HSC effective 1-31-01. He recommends that his alternate, **T. Wilson**, serve out the remainder of his term.

**COAST GUARD COTP'S REPORT, L. Hereth.** (1) **P. Gautier** submitted a written report of port operations statistics for pollution response and investigations and significant port safety events for the period 1-1-01 to 1-31-01, which is made a part of these minutes. There were three propulsion and

one steering failure during the period. (2) **L. Hereth** reported on a letter received by USCG MSO from the Union Pacific Railroad Company expressing their concerns regarding incidents at the UPRR Bridge, the most recent involved a crane barge hitting a span adjacent to the lift span. The UPRR Company cited nine allisions in the past four years, noting that, although most incidents were minor, the most recent could have been devastating not only to the UPRR but to the entire SF Bay Area. (3) **L. Hereth** referred to the USCG's *Proposal for the Vessel "Safe Transit" Program*, which was submitted to the HSC at the January meeting. The proposal was developed in response to an overall increase in steering and propulsion casualties since 1996. Because most casualties can be attributed to improper maintenance of shipboard systems, the program would consist of a voluntary standard of care and increased oversight by various agencies. There are common threads among all ports and the intent is to pick from the work that has been done elsewhere and expand upon it. The CG could do this alone, but a broader-based effort with HSC participation would be more appealing. In addition, the HSC can provide a lot of talent. **John Caplis**, USCG Project Manager for the project, added that WISPA will review the document and respond. PMSA and TeeKay Tanker representatives have also been approached. Question: Once the paper outlining standards of care is developed with input, then what? **L. Hereth**: Thousands of copies of the document will be printed and distributed to all vessel operators transiting the SF Bay Area. The USCG boarding program will distribute them and perhaps the pilots. It is not intended that this will result in regulations; there are already regulations for most of this. The intention is to promulgate and emphasize best practices. Question: Will it be printed in multiple languages? **L. Hereth**: Yes, it can be. **John Berg**, PMSA, noted that a similar voluntary program is in place in Puget Sound. VTS asks vessels if the propulsion/steering tests have been performed. The Chair stated that, in light of the fact that in 2001 the remaining dry cargo vessels will come under the Safety Management Code, this may be a good project for the Human Factors Work Group. The project also comes under the purview of the Navigation Work Group, but since it mostly involves procedure, Human Factors seems the best place. **L. Hereth** asked if the work group chair can reach out for input and participation from outside the HSC. The Chair responded yes and **L. Hereth** added that the USCG will dedicate **J. Caplis**' time so the project can move to completion in short order.

**CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT, A. Steinbrugge.** A written report with statistics for the month of January, 2001 is made a part of these minutes. There were no calls to OSPR in January.

**OSPR REPORT.** (1) **A. Storm** swore in new HSC member **Don Watters**, representing the dry cargo carriers. Question: Has OSPR looked at a tanker representative replacement for **Marc Bayer**? Not yet.

**NOAA REPORT, M. Gallagher.** The print-on-demand chart product will be updated and corrected at the time of printing. The original contractor has been replaced by Ocean Graphics, Inc., of Minnesota. The first charts will be available in April. So far, one vendor has been established, Waypoint Marine in Alameda. Charts will cost \$20 plus shipping. When the order is placed, it goes to Minnesota, where it is printed and “overnighted” to the buyer. The equipment necessary to provide the high quality charts involves a big investment that no local printer/vendor has offered to make. The charts will have a large margin at the side to include relevant information. The charts will be available in two versions, one geared to the commercial user and one to the recreational user. **M. Gallagher** will be looking for what information should go into the margin for each version and would like input. Question:

What is the difference between the commercial and recreational versions? **M. Gallagher.** The commercial version will include information on escort zones, bridge clearances, etc. The recreational version will contain EPIRB and radio information, etc. Everything on the actual chart will be identical. **M. Brown:** Who in the recreational community is working on the sidebar? **M. Gallagher.** No one at this point. There are examples of what headquarters has developed and additional input is encouraged.

Question: Will the sidebar appear on all NOAA charts? **M. Gallagher.** No, only on print-on-demand charts. Congress wants NOAA to get out of the chart business. If the print-on-demand program is accepted by mariners, NOAA will be out in a couple of years. Question: Will the sidebar appear on electronic versions of the charts? **M. Gallagher.** There are no plans to do that at this time. There may not be room on the computer screen. Question: Couldn't the sidebar be added on a page or tab? **M. Gallagher.** Probably. The charts can be customized with a logo or other information for volume customers. **Lynn Korwatch, MX/CH,** added that Ocean Graphics will have a representative and display at the National HSC Meeting. Question: Can print-on-demand charts be purchased online? **M. Gallagher.** Not yet, but probably in the future.

**COE REPORT, D. Dwinell.** (1) Seven operational maintenance and dredging projects have been approved and funded for the SF Bay Area for 2001: the main ship channel, March/April; Richmond Outer Harbor and Southampton Alcatraz SF-11, March/April; Richmond Inner Harbor Channel, May/June; Oakland Inner and Outer Harbor Channels, mid-June/July; Suisun Bay, July; Larkspur Ferry Channel, mid-May/June; and San Leandro Marine Upland, rescheduled from January to July due to herring and least tern environmental windows which limit dredging from December-June. (2) The total tonnage of debris collected on SF Bay during January was approximately 135 tons, up from 72.5 tons

during December, due to high winds and high tides. The Corps' South Pacific Division Resource Management Board has approved budgeting, design and procurement of a new, faster debris vessel to replace the WWII era Grizzly at a cost of approximately \$2 million. Budgeting, funding, design and construction will take five to six years. (3) The 50' Oakland Project continues to move forward. The Corps has submitted the project cooperation agreement to Corps Headquarters and hopes to have it signed in April so the Inner Harbor turning basin contract can be awarded in April. Environmental groups have filed a suit, citing the Federal Endangered Species Act, but the Corps has not seen it yet. All permits are in place. (3) The Rock Removal Feasibility Study has been funded and is underway, with completion projected for 9-02. (4) Pinole Shoal Channel maintenance dredging is on a two-year cycle, last dredged in July, 1999. It didn't make the cut for the 2001 dredging budget and has been reprogrammed into the 2002 budget request. The Corps is in the process of performing a new condition survey and will work to get the information out as soon as possible. The last condition survey, 9-00, showed the channel centerline below project depth of -35' MLLW, with slight shoaling along a short portion of the southern toe. Dredging needs will be evaluated based on the new survey. (5) Congress added \$250,000 to the 2001 budget to initiate a local cost-shared feasibility study to justify construction of the Avon Turning Basin as part of the J. F. Baldwin Ship Channel Project, Phase III. A draft 50/50 agreement has been submitted to Contra Costa County for their consideration and the county is working with the users to obtain funds. (6) Post-dredge survey on Suisun Channel shows a controlling depth of -36.5' MLLW, which is 1.5' below the authorized depth of -35' MLLW. Question: Will Suisun Bay be dredged in the near future? **D. Dwinell:** Dredging is scheduled in July for the shipping channel. Question: What has been the response from Contra Costa County regarding the Avon Turning Basin? **D. Dwinell:** The county has been a good sponsor for Corps projects and it is expected that that will continue for this project.

**NAVIGATION WORK GROUP, L. Teague.** (1) **L. Teague** expressed appreciation for Corps of Engineers participation at the HSC. (2) **Eric Dohm**, San Francisco Bar Pilots, reported that the Contra Costa County Water Agency met last week with representatives of Ultramar, Shore Terminals and the COE. The county is supportive of the project and it could start as early as the summer of 2002. (3) **E. Dohm** reported that survey information is now being distributed more quickly by the use of e-mail and the COE and pilots are working on electronic transmission. **L. Teague** added that HSC involvement was productive. (4) **Kenny Levin**, Business Director, SFBP, reported that pilot representatives met earlier this week with representatives of OSPR to look at the pilot laptop project. The pilots' evaluation is due to the MX by 3-15-01. The pilots have concerns that the program may end because of funding issues. The laptop program is not mature and ready for use. The units are bulky and heavy; pilots are

reluctant to carry an extra eighteen pounds. Laptops have tremendous potential and the pilots would like to see the research and development continued. **A. Storm** added that the contract for OSPR funds ends 4-9-01. Whether or not the project continues will depend on who steps up to fund it. Question: Why is OSPR funding ending? **A. Storm:** A block of money that OSPR received in a settlement was identified for navigational projects in various ports by the former Administrator. This became part of a state budget bill whose provisions legally expire on June 30. Question: Does that apply to all projects in all ports? **A. Storm:** Yes. Question: How much money are we talking about? **A. Storm:** Approximately \$.5 million for SF; \$.45 million for LA/LB; \$900,000 for San Diego; \$50,000 for Port Hueneme and \$45,000 for Humboldt Bay. Chair: Where do we see this going, to the state budget for funding? **A. Storm:** OSPR has no plans to do that. When the funds came to OSPR the Administrator directed it to navigation projects rather than OSPR operations. Question: Is this the same funding source for the Automated Information System? **A. Storm:** Yes. OSPR originally thought that Lockheed Martin would provide some funding, but when Ross Engineering came in, Lockheed Martin stepped back. **T. Mar** added that these were research and development pilot projects. The hardware remains when OSPR money is gone. Others can step in and use the hardware to continue the research and development. **A. Storm** stated that he believed the MX would fund AIS until the end of June at a cost of \$1200/month for the repeater site and MX staff. **L. Korwatch** responded that she can't say that the MX has the money to fund AIS. Counterparts in LA/LB and SD are looking to get the local ports to sit down and collectively agree to fund the system. The situation is different in the SF Bay Area. There are too many port authorities, which is why it has to go back to the state for funding. It would be good to see all these projects, including PORTS tied together. If these projects were funded through the General Fund they would be covered on a year-to-year basis. **A. Storm** added that, if the MX can't keep AIS operating, the overall project will end in April. The ship-to-ship information will work, but the repeater will be gone and the MX will be out of the loop. The laptop R&D projects will end at the same time. OSPR is requiring evaluation reports on AIS and the laptops, which will be a product that can be passed on to the next players or used to raise funds. Question: Based on what is contained in the written reports, is there potential for OSPR to get involved later? **A. Storm** responded that he has heard no talk of that. No funding source has been identified and there is no money in OSPR's operating fund. There is a new Administrator coming on in April and things could change depending on his priorities.

**UNDERWATER ROCKS WORK GROUP, R. Smith.** **R. Smith** introduced **Steve Sullivan** of Sea Survey, Benicia, who performed the hydrographic survey portion of the feasibility study. **S. Sullivan** outlined how the rocks were mapped over the past three months, using remote sensing, side

scan sonar and a marine magnetometer. He provided an overview of the history of earlier rock lowering projects and historical accidents involving the rocks. Graphic depictions of Arch, Blossom and Shag Rocks were presented. **S. Sullivan** presented evidence that the formation known as Unnamed Rock, was not a rock, but rather a submerged sand dune with two ridges. There is evidence that it is dredgeable unconsolidated sand that may be moving and occasionally rearing up. He recommended removing it from the rock removal project because it is not a rock, and monitoring it.

**HUMAN FACTORS WORK GROUP, M. Beatie.** The work group met on 2-6-01 to review the *BCDC Bay Plan Update Proposal*. **M. Beatie** reviewed the group's written report, which is made a part of these minutes. The work group acknowledged the work done by **Nick Salcedo** and, in conclusion, recommended that the HSC convey to BCDC that: (1) The HSC supports BCDC's goal of updating its Bay Plan so that the BCDC permitting process will promote navigation safety and the prevention of oil spills. (2) The detailed policies as proposed need to be reconsidered, and as written are unlikely to garner wide support from the maritime community. (3) The HSC is neither equipped nor tasked with reviewing the Bay Plan. The issues raised by the document involve the jurisdiction of multiple agencies, where clear differences of opinion exist on the legal meaning of the text and their impact. Other than providing comment as individuals, we do not see a role for the HSC. (4) The HSC encourages BCDC to work with the USCG, OSPR and other state and local agencies to clarify the proposal's language to ensure the process is improved and not complicated. **N. Salcedo** thanked the committee and stated that BCDC will continue to work with the USCG, State Lands and OSPR. He added that he would come back and report to the HSC before going back to the Commission, so individuals can input. The Chair asked if it was necessary for the HSC to vote or write a letter to BCDC. **N. Salcedo** responded that the HSC does not need to vote on the issue because, in an earlier meeting, BCDC withdrew its request for HSC support. **J. Lundstrom** suggested that the HSC accept the committee report. **M. Brown** referred back to a vote taken three meetings prior regarding sending a letter to BCDC. She suggested that the work group's conclusions be incorporated into that letter. There were no objections. **N. Salcedo** announced that the new Chair of BCDC is **Barbara Kaufman**. The Chair went on record commending **S. Merritt** for the quick work and focus on this issue.

**PREVENTION THROUGH PEOPLE WORK GROUP, M. Brown.** (1) With the permission of the Chair, the work group is applying to Fish and Wildlife for a grant to publish 50,000 to 100,000 copies of the Channel 16 brochure for distribution to recreational boaters. (2) The next project for the group was suggested by VTS. The group will draft a listing of the common names of various points in

the SF Bay Area for recreational boaters and fishermen who don't usually frequent the Bay Area so they will understand the references they hear on the radio. The intention is to update this list annually. Distribution will be small and VTS will handle it.

**TUG ESCORT WORK GROUP, G. Hallin.** (1) The work group met on 1-11-01 with representatives of the USCG, OSPR and industry to address OSPR's request that the HSC look at the request for escort exemption from a company with a millennium class tug towing a double hull tank barge. It was the consensus of the work group to deny the request because (a) the issue was studied in detail by the Tug Escort Sub-Committee in 1995; (b) the tugs in question aren't fully redundant; and (c) the regulations were written to address tankers only. **MOTION** by G. Hallin, seconded by M. Brown "to deny the request to OSPR." **R. Smith:** It is not the HSC's place to deny, but rather to make recommendations to OSPR who has the authority to respond to requests for exemption. **A. Storm** stated that OSPR came to the HSC and the Tug Escort Work Group with the request that the committee look at it and decide if the HSC wants to look at changing the tug escort regulations to address tugs and barges. He suggested language and the **MOTION** was amended, with the concurrence of the second to state "The Harbor Safety Committee does not recommend changing current tug escort regulations to provide exemption for tug and barges at this time." Discussion continued and it was pointed out that the applying company did not have a tug with fully redundant systems in the engine room. In addition, the issue of redundant tow lines has not been addressed. The language of the motion was further amended to state "The Harbor Safety Committee does not recommend changing current tug escort regulations to provide exemption for fully redundant tugs towing double hulled barges at this time." **G. Hallin** and **B. Dorsh** both stated that the work group is not opposed to looking at fully redundant tugs towing double hulled barges in the future, when someone with the equipment requests an exemption. **A. Storm** reiterated that OSPR is looking for a recommendation that the committee does not want to look at changing the regulations. Further discussion of wording the motion to reflect the consensus of work group and HSC members. **M. Brown** noted that no motion before the full HSC is necessary. The Tug Escort Work Group can convey directly to OSPR that they do not recommend changing the regulations. The maker withdrew the motion with the concurrence of the second.

**PORTS WORK GROUP, T. Covini.** Nothing to add.

**OLD BUSINESS.** National Harbor Safety Committee Meeting. **L. Korwatch** introduced **Lt. Cmdr. Greg Case**, USCG Waterways Management Division, Washington, DC. **G. Case** thanked the SF

HSC for taking the role of co-host for the meeting and distributed an agenda and brochure. The CG would like to integrate the Marine Transportation System with the meeting. The goals of this year's National HSC Meeting are to allow HSC's to share information and to improve awareness of maritime transportation through an outreach and education program. Non-traditional participants representing political, environmental, educational and scientific interests are being invited. The CG wants to explain the structure of the Marine Transportation System and how it can be used locally. This outreach program is necessary to convey how important the marine industry is to the U.S. The marine industry is the most invisible industry in the U. S., although it may be the most important, with responsibility for movement of 95% of imports in international trade and 60% of national trade. The importance of the outreach is to let people know the importance of Harbor Safety Committees and marine transportation, to get support for needed changes and to help improve the industry. The first panel at the meeting will address HSC success stories, highlighting the variety of harbor safety committees, including state mandated, federal, grass roots and COTP-created bodies, large and small. The idea is not to have cookie-cutter local HSC's, but to look at the differences and how they work in each venue and what the scope of their responsibilities is. **G. Case** thanked those sponsors who have come forward, including Bay Link Ferry, Golden Gate Ferries and Blue and Gold Ferries, who will be sponsoring harbor tours. Question: Who does this brochure go to? **G. Case:** It has gone to everyone on the list from the last national meeting and to as many individual lists as are available. 2800 have gone out so far and more brochures can be made available. Question: Is there room for more sponsorship? If the brochures are done, will there be acknowledgement for sponsors? **L. Korwatch:** Yes, there is plenty of room for sponsorship. Companies can display banners, etc. and more brochures can be produced with sponsors identified. The initial brochures were produced by the CG to get something out. The actual cost per attendee is approximately \$500, but the fee has been set at \$300 to get a wide range of participation from all over. The goal is to raise \$24,000 to off-set the difference. The ferry tours are important because they will get people out to see the bay and wetlands and the importance of the work being done in this area. Anyone interested in sponsorship can contact **L. Korwatch** at 415-441-6600 or by e-mail at [korwatch@sfmtx.org](mailto:korwatch@sfmtx.org). Question: How many attendees are expected? **L. Korwatch:** 200, with 50-75 from the local area. Since OSPR is sponsoring attendees from the LA/LB HSC, she suggested that Humboldt, Hueneme and San Diego be included. **A. Storm** will investigate.

**NEW BUSINESS:** **M. Beatie** reported on the SF Vessel Mutual Assistance Plan (SFVMAP). The plan evolved out of a CG ruling that all passenger vessels must carry inflatable buoyant apparatus for 100% of their capacity. In researching, the local ferry and dinner cruise companies found that, by law, boats cruising within one mile of land are not required to have such devices. Representatives of these

companies met and came up with a plan to have each boat carry a buoyant apparatus (floatation raft) to accommodate 30% of the vessel's maximum load and one 25-man canister inflatable. In the event of any catastrophe, the ferries can serve as satellite rescue platforms. Small CG boats can go in to get people and take them out to the ferries at the perimeter, which will have canister inflatables tied off the front. **M. Beatie** relayed details of a recent incident where two local ferries and a pilot boat were able to successfully respond to a man overboard situation at Anchorage 7, partly because of their speed. On 2-20-01, the CG and ferries will stage a demonstration of the procedure for taking a seriously injured person from the water to a helicopter. The demonstration will include the deployment of an inflatable canister from a ferry, the launching of a rigid inflatable from a CG cutter and swimmers in the water. Anyone interested from the HSC is welcome to attend. The ferry will be leaving the Ferry Building at 1230. **M. Beatie** and **L. Hereth** complimented and thanked each other's organization for the success of this cooperative effort to develop the SFVMAP.

The next HSC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 3-8-01 at 10:00 at the Port of Richmond Harbor Master's Office. The Port of San Francisco offices are moving the week-end of February 16-20. The next time a meeting is scheduled for the Port of San Francisco, it will be held at Pier One.

MOTION to adjourn by **L. Teague**, seconded by **J. Lundstrom**. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 1220.

Respectfully submitted,

**Captain Lynn Korwatch**  
Executive Secretary