

MARINE EXCHANGE

OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

Fort Mason Center, Building B, Suite 325, San Francisco, CA 94123-1380
Telephone (415) 441-6600 Telex 470-312 Ansback MEXSF Fax (415) 441-3080

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

Ernest Schenk
Trident Navigation Co., Inc.

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

Arthur A. Goepf, III
Marsh & McLennan

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

D. Carl Hanson
Southwest Marine, Inc

THIRD VICE PRESIDENT

Capt. Ghaffar Tikari
General Steamship Corp

TREASURER

William R. Beck
Dahl-Beck Electric Co

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Terry Hunter
Marine Exchange

DIRECTORS

Deanna L. Behr
Hoyt Shepston, Inc.

Raymond Boyle
Port of Oakland

Bill Buffalow
Levin Richmond Terminals

Gregory Canonica
Fritz Maritime Agencies

Jack Conrad
Port of San Francisco

Capt. Graham Cullen
Cullen Maritime Services

Saunders Jones
American President Lines

Dennis Kelly
Kelly, Cox et al.

Capt. Raoul Matson
Star Shipping, Inc.

Mary McMillan
Westar Marine

John McNeill
Marine Terminals Corp.

Capt. Arthur J. Thomas
S.F. Bar Pilots

Bruce Wilson
Stevedoring Services of
America

Brian Wolff
Radio-Holland

MINUTES

HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE

10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 11, 1991

Board Room, Port of San Francisco

1. Chairman Graham Cullen, called the meeting to order. The following people were in attendance as reflected by a sign-in sheet: Alan Steinbrugge, Marine Exchange; Ed Willis, Department of Fish and Game, Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office; LCDR Bill Carey, U.S. Coast Guard, Marine Safety Office; Nancy Carroll, Department of Fish and Game, Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office; Terry Hunter, Marine Exchange; Capt. Carl Bowler, San Francisco Bar Pilots; Capt. Arthur Thomas, San Francisco Bar Pilots; Rob Floerke, Department of Fish and Game, Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office; Saunders Jones, American President Companies; Steve Ricks, Clean Bay; Margot J. Brown, National Boating Federation; Bill Capasso, Capasso's Marine Marketing; Rob Garvie, Boughey, Garvie & Bushner; CDR Ed Rollison, U.S. Coast Guard, VTS San Francisco; LCDR Ernest Gibson, U.S. Coast Guard, VTS San Francisco; Michael Fajans, PTM Consultants; Bruce Block, Pacific Inter Yacht Club Association; Jack Farless, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, S.F. District; Charles Mitchell, Port of San Francisco; and Ernest Schenk, President, Marine Exchange.

2. Chairman Cullen thanked the members of the committee for the opportunity to chair the committee for the past two years and introduced the new committee chairman, Captain Arthur Thomas.

3. E. Schenk, President of the Marine Exchange, thanked G. Cullen for the time, effort and dedication he gave to the committee and thanked A. Thomas for taking the chair.

4. Opening remarks and welcome from A. Thomas: This committee, known first as the Harbor Safety Advisory Committee, is a subcommittee of the Marine Exchange of the San Francisco Bay Region. The Marine Exchange was formed in the days of the gold rush. Since its inception it has been the center of information gathering and disbursement for local ocean and bay traffic as well as a provider of communication services for industry, the pilots and recreational boaters. With the assistance of the Coast Guard, the Harbor Safety Advisory Committee was responsible for the radar at Pier 45 which was the forerunner of VTS. The importance of this committee will grow as it continues to address issues of interest and impact.

5. Report from M. Fajans, Project Manager, Vallejo Ferry Project: The firm of Pacific Transportation Management Consultants was chosen by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the City of Vallejo to study high speed water transit policies and procedures to develop operating standards for ferry projects to be funded as a result of post-earthquake legislation regarding ferry transportation and the passage of Proposition 116, the Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990, which allocated funds to the City of Vallejo for such a program.

Elements of the study include research for short term enhancements to the present ferry system, development of ideas for long term enhancements/new features, and the proposed functioning of Vallejo as a transit gateway for the Greater Bay Area. One of the first issues to be addressed has been travel time. In order to compete with modes of land travel, ferry trips must be as fast or faster than other forms of travel during peak commute periods. Under the Jones Act, vessels used in the ferry system must be American made. The question was, are there any American-built vessels that are fast enough and financially feasible. In addition to looking at faster technology the study was required to choose a vessel(s) of a proven design.

In analyzing whether or not ferry service could become a viable transit mode, the study looked for sources of additional capital on a continuing basis, which would be necessary after Proposition 116 money ran out, to be used for construction and maintenance of transfer facilities, docks and terminals. An incentive to developing a bigger and better ferry system is the reduction of traffic on Interstate 80 and the elimination of a need for additional bridges or cross bay tracks.

While ferries are still responsible for an insignificant number of total trips during peak commute periods, they do account for 10% of the Marin-SF traffic and 3% to 5% of Vallejo-SF traffic. There is the potential for a 10% to 20% reduction of I-80 traffic if the Vallejo ferry system is upgraded and ridership increases. The current Vallejo-SF ferry trip is fifteen minutes faster than an express bus and about the same as a car trip on a good day.

The first two tasks assigned to the study have been completed. A statement of goals of the study and an evaluation of current ferry services (Table ES1, attached) have been written. Now it remains to project traffic and research the options for improving the ferry system. As a positive model, note that Marine World has generated 10,000 to 15,000 SF-Vallejo trips with a potential of 100,000 to 150,000 Marine World visitors using the ferry system.

To alleviate congestion on the SF side, the addition of a second float at Pier 1½ will double that area's capacity.

The market has been examined for vessels with the required technology and speed to meet the requirements of the various cities with current or projected ferry services. It has been noted that trips must be completed in a period of time short enough to allow hourly and/or half-hourly scheduling, which will be easier for the commuter to remember and will facilitate connections to other modes of transportation.

The main safety factors to be considered involve the high traffic patterns created by recreational vessels on weekends and the need to use no-wake vessels as ferries.

Phase 1 recommendations will be made within a couple of months.

6. Report by E. Willis, Acting Deputy Administrator of the Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office, Department of Fish and Game: E. Willis introduced members of his staff in attendance: R. Floerke, Enforcement Officer for No. California, and N. Carroll, Planner, who will be working directly on proposed guidelines for harbor safety plans.

The authority for the creation of this office under the Department of Fish and Game comes from the enactment of SB 2040. The prime concern of SB 2040 and this newly-established office is the prevention of oil spills. By July 1, 1991, as a result of this legislation, the office will have 111 staff positions and a budget of \$15 million.

The bill directs the office to look at marine safety, vessel safety within harbors, a future inspection program, the possibility of VTS assistance for various state harbors, harbor operations safety, and contingency planning in the event of a spill. The bill mandates that the office review and evaluate existing programs and fill the gaps. Financial responsibility for damages and cost of clean-up was set at \$500 million for 1992, \$750 million for 1995 and a billion dollar liability to be in effect at 2000. The chain of notification in the event of a spill requires first a notification to the Office of Emergency Services who then notifies the Oil Spill Prevention Response Office. While the burden of responsibility is being determined, the State General Fund will lend the money to fund the response effort. A system of fines is to be established to be paid by entities that do not have contingency plans. Trained personnel will be placed throughout the state to respond to spills. \$4.5 million has been allocated to design a wildlife rehabilitation program at a Santa Cruz Center. In addition, the state will enter into contracts with existing centers to further aid the rehabilitation of wildlife. An elaborate contingency planning process is to be implemented, effecting all operators of vessels, facilities and harbors. The office is currently developing preliminary guidelines and all vessels, facilities and harbors will be required to follow these guidelines in the development of the mandated contingency plans. A statewide contingency plan is to be developed and local governments will be asked to develop their own contingency plans.

The office is responsible for establishing subcommittees. The State Information Oil Spill Committee will be comprised of 19 departments. The Governor will appoint an Administrator for the office and that person will in turn appoint Harbor Safety Committees.

The oil industry funds this program through fees on barrels of oil transported. The Administrator may set a fee of zero to four cents a barrel to generate operating money for the office and a fee of up to twenty-five cents a barrel to maintain a response trust fund. The bill requires that this fund be \$50 million (which took 6 months to collect.)

The office will perform three operations. A scientific program staffed by environmental specialists, who will operate labs to do chemical analysis of spills; field personnel, who will address prevention and response; research teams, who will investigate factors related to wildlife rehabilitation; and economists, who will be responsible for determining costs related to financial responsibility. The second operation will involve enforcement and inspection; the third will focus on planning and regulation. It is expected that it will take one and a half to two years to have all elements in place and fully functioning.

The office will look to this Marine Exchange Harbor Safety Committee for input and perhaps as a source of members for the harbor safety committees to be formed under the auspices of the office. These committee members will be appointed for terms of three years. Funds are in place to cover the expenses of these committees, which will be comprised of captains of the various port authorities, tanker operators, representatives from commercial fishing operations, recreational boaters, pilot groups and labor organizations. Committee members may also be drawn from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, tug and barge companies, the Navy and the Coast Guard.

The aim is to have emergency regulations in place by July 31, 1991.

An Industry Advisory Committee will be formed with members from the oil companies, shipping companies, wildlife rehabilitation experts, the Coast Guard and N.O.A.A. The legislation says that the Administrator is asked to make the Bay Area a priority. This committee will look at tug escort use, anchorage design, emergency routing, enforcement issues and the use and funding of VTS. Plans are due from this committee December 31, 1991.

A. Thomas asked E. Willis how state and federal legislation tie into one another. E. Willis responded that the office will work to avoid duplication and to see that there is no conflict with existing programs. A. Thomas added that VTS currently exists in San Francisco and is starting up in the Los Angeles/Santa Barbara area.

B. Capasso pointed out that companies want concrete input as to what is to be required of them before they make a capital outlay. E. Willis responded that preliminary regulations are to be adopted by the end of July on an emergency basis.

B. Capasso noted that the possibility of unlimited financial responsibility scares the affected business community. E. Willis stated that this question is still open.

R. Garvie asked about the forms which will need to be completed in connection with reporting contingency planning and the possibility of considerable paperwork. E. Willis responded that this is a valid concern. He stated that the goal in establishing reporting procedures will be to avoid duplication of current procedures and to develop a simple system for reporting. A number of people from the business community will be involved in input to the creation of a reporting system and the necessary forms.

There was a question as to who will be in charge in case of an oil spill. E. Willis' answer was that the Coast Guard says that they are in charge and the legislation says that the Administrator appointed by the Governor will be in charge. The aim will be to develop a memorandum of understanding between the Oil Spill Prevention and Response Office and the Coast Guard in order to keep what the Coast Guard needs in tact and still give the office what it needs.

There was a question as to whether or not there have been studies of past spill operations. E. Willis answered that there have not been any such studies, but that they will be conducted when the staff is available to conduct studies of past spill impacts and operations.

The question was asked as to whether the industry-led group established by this Harbor Safety Committee is still working on the oil spill issue. The chair responded "no".

E. Willis concluded that the Department of Fish and Game has always had the responsibility of prevention and response to spills; SB 2040 allows the department to have the necessary funds and the opportunity to be properly staffed.

7. C. Bowler asked for support for the San Francisco Bar Pilots' effort to get up-to-date tidal current charts published: The charts now available to the pilots are obsolete, having been drawn from a database done in the 1920's. The pilots have made contact with N.O.A.A. A complete study of currents at the Golden Gate Bridge needs to be made and that data added to the information from a study conducted five or six years ago. This effort will involve expense and will require political support. C. Bowler asks for the support of user groups as represented by the people in attendance at this meeting. The Coast Guard could donate staff time on buoy tenders to set up the necessary instruments for the study; users could supply small boats. C. Bowler stated that we have the resources in the bay to make this work and called for a resolution from the Harbor Safety Committee to lead the way. He added that there are time constraints because there are other ports who want the same work done. J. Farless of the Corps of Engineers agreed to make resources available in connection with regular dredge runs. On behalf of the Captain of the Port, E. Rollison expressed support. C. Bowler added that the San Francisco Bar Pilots may be able to donate the services of a pilot boat on a short-term basis. The support and cooperation of all is needed because N.O.A.A. does not get enough funding to do projects like this without self-help.

The chair suggested that the Harbor Safety Committee form a subcommittee to go forward with this project. C. Bowler was asked to chair the committee. Committee members will include M. Brown, J. Farless, A. Steinbrugge, and B. Block.

It was noted that the Bay Model in Sausalito might be a source for some informational input and that the Naval Oceanographic Service may have or should have an interest in this data.

8. C. Bowler reported on racons/bridge clearance illumination: The study and resultant use of racons is an on-going project. Racons on a bridge give larger vessels a radar indicator for where the center of the bridge is; of the greatest use to commercial vessels. They will be installed on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge this summer and will go on all nine bridges as money becomes available.

Brighter lighting has been installed on a span of the Bay Bridge and it is noticeably brighter. Richmond will have new lights installed.

9. E. Rollison reported on VTS: The Coast Guard is rapidly preparing a port needs study which is due to be complete in mid-July for submission to the Secretary and Congress. He expects funding for some number of ports to come with adoption of the report. The report will recommend an order in which ports shall be funded, but the Congress can reorder this list.

Locally, within two months, we should see proposed rule-making that this VTS be converted to mandatory participation. After the proposed rule-making is completed, there will be a 60-90 day period for comments and then final rule-making will take place. Completion of this process is expected sometime between December, 1991, and June, 1992. E. Rollison suggested that this should not cause a great deal of controversy.

E. Rollison suggested looking at the current traffic separation scheme. As a result of his observation, he believes the scheme merits a look and suggests that a subcommittee be formed to address this task.

The question was asked as to whether there are adequate funds for VTS. E. Rollison responded that there is no danger of a lack in funds for five years. The EXXON VALDEZ incident has changed the face of things so that the suggestion for such a cut is not likely to come up again.

E. Rollison was asked when he is leaving. He responded that it will happen sometime in mid-summer. T. Hunter thanked him for all his work on this committee.

The chair asked S. Jones to head the proposed subcommittee to review the current traffic separation scheme. Other committee members will include J. Shanower (pilots) and B. Block. E. Rollison offered his successor, CMDR Peter Dolan, as a member.

10. B. Carey reported on the scheduled Oil Response Drill: The drill will be held at the Oakland Convention Center on Thursday, June 13, 1991. Registration takes place from 0700 to 0800. Briefing will be at 0800 and the drill will be conducted from 0830 to 1400, at which time the table top drill will end. It will be followed by a question and answer period for about an hour and a half. Debriefing and a critique will take place the next morning in the Convention Center Ballroom. Registration will take place from 0730 to 0830 and the meeting will last two or three hours. The Regional Response Team will meet that same afternoon. There is no admission fee and anyone interested is invited to attend the exercise.

11. E. Rollison reported on OPA 90 (oil spill response): OPA 90 addresses VTS and buoy tenders; strike teams will be reassessed and the Atlantic team is coming on line.

The Marine Environment Protection Agency is trying to set up Port Area Advisory Committees. This involves three geographic areas: the San Francisco Bay Area, Cape San Martin to Humboldt Bay (N. Coast) and Pillar Point to Santa Barbara (S. Coast). Each area represents a different type of problem. These advisory committees will be comprised of politicians, environmentalists and representatives from industry.

In the event of a spill, the OSC/Port Captain will be in charge; only one person can be in charge. However, any response must be a joint effort until the point where one person must make a decision.

OPA 90 adds five to six people to the 11th District to help OSC with response planning. E. Rollison suggests that a memorandum of understanding will result in the utilization of the same committees and that the Coast Guard will include state regulations in their regulations. There is need to coordinate between Federal and state authorities to avoid duplication.

The chair asked if anyone would like to discuss any non-agendaed items.

S. Ricks of Clean Bay noted that he receives numerous calls in connection with contingency planning for oil spill response. There is significant confusion as to who needs them and what resources will be available. It appears that Coast Guard (Federal) and state requirements will be different.

Minutes
Harbor Safety Committee
June 11, 1991
Page 7

B. Carey responded that it would be premature to structure contingency plans until something (regulations) comes out. However, he did note work should begin if one has no plan in place.

The chair requested that today's attendees get the word out to operators, etc., that meetings of this committee will be held at least quarterly, and probably more often as issues of import and impact are addressed.

The meeting was adjourned at 1200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Terry Hunter". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

TERRY HUNTER
Executive Director

TABLE ES1. FERRY SERVICE EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Sausalito		Larkspur		Tiburon	Alameda	Oakland	Vallejo
	<u>GGT</u>	<u>R&W</u>	<u>GGT</u>	<u>R&W</u>	<u>R&W</u>	<u>R&W</u>	<u>R&W</u>	<u>R&W</u>
Mobility/Performance								
- Travel Time Impact	M	S	M	S	M	U	M	
- Impact on Highways/Bridges	M	M	S	M	M	U	M	
- Impact on Transit Ridership	S	S	S	S	M	U	S	
- Intermodal Coordination	M	U	S	M	M	M	M	
- Non-work Travel Impact	S	S	M	M	U	M	M	
- Emergency Preparedness	S	S	S	S	M	S	S	
Energy and Environment								
- Energy & Air Quality Impact	S	S	S	S	M	U	S	
- Dredging Impact	NA	NA	U	S	S	S	S	
- Wake Impact	S	S	U	S	S	M	M	
- Ecological Impact	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	
Socio-economic								
- Consistency with Plans	M	M	M	M	S	M	S	
- Joint Development Potential	U	U	M	U	M	M	S	
- Recreation/Tourism Usage	S	S	M	S	U	M	S	
Financial								
<i>Investment</i>								
- Capital Cost	S	NA	M	NA	M	M	S	
<i>Operational</i>								
- Farebox Recovery	S	NA	M	NA	M	M	S	
- Local Support	S	NA	S	NA	S	M	S	
- Cost/Seat	M	NA	M	M	M	M	M	
- Subsidy/Passenger	M	NA	M	NA	M	M	M	
Service								
- Reliability	S	S	S	S	M	M	S	
Comfort								
- Facilities	U	U	S	U	U	M	M	
- Vessels	M	S	S	M	M	M	M	
Accessibility								
- Facilities	U	U	S	U	M	M	M	
- Vessels	M	M	S	M	U	U	M	
San Francisco Facilities								
- Comfort	S	U	S	U	U	U	U	
- Accessibility	S	M	S	M	M	M	M	

S = Satisfactory

M = Marginal

U = Unsatisfactory

NA = Not Applicable