

MINUTES

HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

10:00 a.m., Thursday, June 13, 2001

Port of Richmond Harbormasters Office, 1340 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA

Grant Stewart, American Ship Management, Chair, called the public meeting to order at 09:05 a.m. and welcomed those in attendance. The secretariat confirmed the presence of a quorum. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: **Len Cardoza**, Port of Oakland; **Tom Wilson**, Port of Richmond; **Jimmy Triplett** (alternate for Nancy Pagan), Benicia Industries; **John Davey**, Port of San Francisco; **Brian Dorsch**, Chevron Shipping Company; **Don Watters**, CSX Lines; **Scott Merritt**, Foss Maritime; **Michael Beatie**, Golden Gate Ferries; **Marina Secchitano** (10:00), International Longshore and Warehouse Union; **Margot Brown**, National Boating Federation; **Larry Teague**, San Francisco Bar Pilots; and **Joan Lundstrom**, Bay Conservation and Development Commission. U. S. Coast Guard representatives **Capt. Larry Hereth**, MSO, and **Cdr. Dave Kranking**, VTS; U. S. Army Corps of Engineers representative, **David Dwinell**; and OSPR representative, **Al Storm**. Also in attendance, more than twenty-five representatives of the interested public.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of the 5-10-01 meeting. **A. Storm**: P. 1, **Brian Dorsch** was absent; **Doug Lathrop** should be shown as alternate to **Brian Dorsch**; and add **Ted Mar**, OSPR representative as present. P. 2, top line, add "**G. Stewart** will serve as Chair and **Scott Merritt** as Vice Chair for the next three years." **D. Kranking**, CG Report: The vessel that grounded at NY Pt. was the PACIFIC SUCCESS. P. 3, Delete "There are concerns about the proposed rule and its effectiveness." No concerns have been submitted, instead minutes should state, "The *Federal Register* gives information on how to express concerns." The reference to the offshore traffic lanes should indicate that the southern traffic lane was reoriented to a true north-south alignment, and the northern traffic lane, which has a northwest-to-southeast orientation from near Point Reyes towards the SF sea buoy, is to be shifted slightly to the south and west." Fourth sentence should be revised to read "A copy of a chartlet showing the corrections. . ." P. 4, line 7, NOAA Report, **Bud Leland's** statement regarding offshore towing lanes, **D. Kranking** doesn't recall the statement but it is not something that VTS SF is studying. MOTION by **M. Brown**, seconded by **L. Teague**, "to approve the minutes of the 5-10-01 meeting as corrected." Motion passed unanimously.

In opening remarks, the Chair reported that **J. Lundstrom** and **Steve Ricks** have been appointed to the OSPR Oil Spill Technical Advisory Committee.

COAST GUARD COTP'S REPORT, L. Hereth. Lt. Cdr. **Kara Satra** submitted a written report of port operations statistics for pollution response and investigations and significant port safety events for the period 5-01 to 5-31-01, which is made a part of these minutes. (a) Significant events included the allision of the OSTANKINO with Richmond Longwharf. The vessel suffered a 20' gash about 3'4" deep, but her hull was not breached and no product entered the water. A tank vessel, anchored 4 miles from the sea buoy, was observed by VTS and the pilots to be dragging anchor. Practices for offshore

anchoring are being reviewed by the CG, operators and pilots. This practice is driven by the cost of escorting once a vessel enters the bay. (b) Three or four changes to the OSR guidelines are published on the CG website. There is a new emphasis on exercise requirements, with the verification process and testing being revisited. There are significant changes in the skimming and containment requirements for small spills, shifting from national to local oversight. A gap in the way coverage is afforded by OSR is being addressed. Previously, if a company could get coverage to a part of a zone, they were certified for the entire zone. This is being revisited on a rush basis, with additional points being added for certification in an area. January, 2002 is the implementation date and companies will have from September to January to make changes in their certification. **L. Hereth** reported (c) In May, 2001 the towing version of the regulations changed significantly. The navigational vessel inspection circular is out (contact **L. Korwatch**, MX, for the website address). Anyone in the towing business should check out the changes in requirements for training, testing and documentation. There are changes in the designations for crewmembers and the crewing requirements have changed. For restated STCW requirements, see 4-01 NAVIC. (d) MSO received a letter from Red & White regarding significant property damage and personal injury as a result of washes. The Chair will address under New Business. (e) The CG held a ceremony last Thursday to recognize the 27 vessels, ferry operators and dinner boats participating in the Vessel Mutual Assistance Program. Everyone in the bay signed up. With an increase in the number of vessels operating on the bay and in the system, the risk goes up. This program addresses the need for rapid response to incidents.

D. Kranking asked about the AIS demonstration scheduled for this meeting and (a) reported that OSPR funded AIS on vessels in SF Bay had a software patch added to it last week. The patch will allow the vessels with AIS to receive VTS tracking data information (radar, standard route tracks), giving those vessels a much fuller picture of traffic conditions. (b) Last fall VTS upgraded their radio control system equipment. In the future, they will be adding software to allow them to patch a caller from one radio frequency to a caller on another frequency or a caller on the same channel who can't communicate because of geography. Question: Was Concord cut off due to budget cuts and, if so, are any others targeted? **D. Kranking**: Yes, that's why Concord was cut, but no other cuts are planned. **L. Korwatch** added that Jeff High's (Coast Guard Director of Waterways Management) testimony on AIS before the U. S. House of Representatives' Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's Sub-Committee on Water Resources and Environment's Sub-Committee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation is available at this meeting or from the MX. The scheduled AIS demonstration by **Jeff McCarthy** of the MX was rescheduled for the next meeting in Oakland because that room is better for the presentation and because, with plan approval on the agenda, today was too full.

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

OSPR REPORT, A. Storm. (1) **A. Storm** reported that, as mentioned by **Bud Leland** at the last meeting, **A. Storm** will continue to be assigned to this HSC by OSPR. (2) The SF tug regulations revision is in the middle of the 45-day public comment period. The language is on the OSPR website. A hearing on the revisions is scheduled for July 5, 2001, at 10:00 at the Bay Model in Sausalito. The period for receipt of written comments will close the end of business that day. (3) The OSPR OSR draft regulations are somewhat controversial. Two workshops have been scheduled. The Northern California workshop will be held at the Shell Martinez Refinery Clubhouse on June 28, 2001 from 1:00 to 4:00. Language and directions are on the OSPR website. (4) The LA/LB tug escort revisions are in Rule Making at OAL for approval. For consistency, they include exactly the same language as the SF for double hull redundancy exemption. (5) **A. Storm** swore in new alternate member for the Port of Richmond, **Norman Chan**, and tanker representative **B. Dorsch**, who was re-appointed.

NOAA REPORT. No report, **M. Gallagher** absent.

COE REPORT, D. Dwinell. The written COE Report, as submitted to the HSC orally, is made a part of these minutes. Referring to the portion of the report that addressed the Oakland -50' Project, **L. Cardoza** added that 14.2% of the COE budget for the next fiscal year was cut in the proposed federal budget. The House Appropriations Sub-Committee for Energy and Water will be meeting and could restore the COE budget. He suggested members and the public contact their legislative representatives to encourage them to support restoring money in the COE budget, especially for navigational projects' operation and maintenance.

The Chair announced new work group assignments, noting that everyone got their first choice. Underwater Rocks Working Group: **L. Cardoza** (D. Adams) (Chair); N. Salcedo. Water Transit Working Group: **N. Pagan** (**J. Triplett**) (Chair); **M. Secchitano** (**G. Lundeberg**); **M. Beatie** (**P. Morgan**). Navigation Working Group: **L. Teague** (**E. Dohm**) (Chair); **J. Davey** (**D. Turner**); **S. Merritt**. Human Factors Working Group: **D. Watters** (Chair); **T. Wilson** (**N. Chan**). Prevention Through People: **M. Brown** (Chair). Tug Escort Working Group: **J. Lundstrom** (Chair); **M. Reasoner** (**R. Smith**); **S. McRobbie** (**T. Covini**); **B. Dorsch** (**D. Lathrop**). The Chair requested that all interested parties participate in the working group meetings.

NAVIGATION WORK GROUP. (1) **E. Dohm** reported that he is working on setting up a system for printing electronic charts from the COE on a new chart plotter purchased by the pilots. The turn around time for getting charts after a COE survey has been cut to as little as a week, versus the two to three months it took a couple of years ago. He is working with **M. Gallagher** of NOAA to integrate

COE and NOAA data. (2) The survey of East Alcatraz Shoal has been completed. (3) The survey of the south San Francisco waterfront/Islais Creek is underway and new rock ships will be calling there.

UNDERWATER ROCKS WORK GROUP. (1) **L. Cardoza** thanked **R. Smith** for his leadership on this committee. (2) The HSC has identified the rocks as a hazard to navigation. The work group conducted a meeting on June 4, 2001, followed by the Alternatives Workshop for the San Francisco Bay Rock Removal Feasibility Study; both held at the Pier 9 Pilot Station. There was wide representation from federal and state agencies, the pilots and maritime interests. The work group is still concerned with the lack of representation from the fishing interests and members will continue to try to get the fishing interests' participation for the scooping/investigation process. Reports on the negotiations for the *Marine Geophysical Investigation* and the *Maritime Archaeology Study* contracts will be available on the CEO SF District web page. The two alternatives that the project can take are either 'no project' or some combination of rock removal strategies. Attendees at the 6-4-01 meeting discussed the Project Statement of Purpose, project objectives and constraints to focus the alternative selection process on structural and non-structural measures to modify the underwater rocks in order to improve navigation safety within the Bay. *The Purpose of the San Francisco Central Bay Rock Removal Project is to take actions to prevent groundings on the rock mounds in the Central San Francisco Bay existing deep draft channels. The prevention of groundings would significantly reduce the risk of oil and fuel spills from occurring in the Central Bay. These actions would further serve to reduce the risk of navigational hazards and significant environmental and economic damages within all of San Francisco Bay.* **B. Dorsch** noted that the statement of purpose refers to rock mounds in the channel and that this is misleading. They are actually outside the channel and would better be described as 'near' the channel. In discussion at the meeting on 6-4-01, the participants acknowledged that all alternatives, including non-structural or operating methods (tug escorts, vessel traffic regulations, emerging technologies) must be considered for the Environmental Impact Study. Referring to the reference to tug escorts, **J. Lundstrom** asked if this could result in the recommendation for additional tugs. **L. Cardoza** responded that the work group will incorporate the past work of the HSC. **J. Lundstrom:** What about mandatory tethering? **L. Cardoza** doesn't see the rock group going that direction, but perhaps the 'no project' alternative would include such issues.

WATER TRANSIT WORK GROUP. **G. Stewart**, HSC Chair, stated that he would like to see this group look at the Red & White Fleet letter to the COTP regarding property damage and injury in the Pier 43 ½ area. The group should look at the issue of wakes generally around the Bay Area. The Chair is hesitant to jump into a problem between two specific companies in this instance. **M. Beatie** noted that Golden Gate Ferries has a new fast ferry under construction. Before it goes into service GGF will contract for a wave wash study, which will be third the company has commissioned to cover Marin and the SF waterfront, one having been conducted in the 1970's and another in the 1990's.

Question: Do the letters indicate where the wakes are coming from? **G. Stewart:** Yes, the letter was very specific. Question: Were the alleged offending company and the Port of SF copied? **G. Stewart:** Representatives of the two companies met with the CG to review the particular incident referred to in the letter. Question from the Chair: Do the HSC members agree that the HSC should look at the issue of wake damage? **L. Hereth** noted that wake damage is a problem everywhere on the coasts. The CG can take action and investigate, can levy civil penalties and, if an operator is found negligent, take action against the operator's license. But, experience has shown that this doesn't work as well as an approach that includes early preventative cooperative efforts. This can be undertaken under the auspices of the Water Transit Authority or the HSC, to draw in all stake holders to address the problem together now. It is difficult to engage in these discussions because the purpose and goal of high-speed ferries is to operate at rapid speeds. Rules of engagement should be developed to maximize speed and minimize damage. **L. Hereth** has no preference as to whether the effort comes from the HSC or WTA. **J. Lundstrom** believes that looking at shoreline and environmental damage by wake, as well as to other vessels, is less an HSC issue and more a WTA issue. **J. Davey** reported that the Port of SF and Vallejo are in a joint project to build a public landing between the two parties involved in the letter referred to earlier. As the ferry system develops, other projects will have landings adjacent to various parties. The Port of SF is landlord to all of these parties and the issue will continue to come up. The port encourages discussions to resolve the problems. **M. Beatie** sees this as the responsibility of WTA, but ferries are not part of the WTA at this time. For now, this is a task for the new HSC work group. **G. Stewart** stated that a public commission may end up designating ferry lanes where other vessels can enter only if they are a survivable craft. He sees a role for the HSC and doesn't believe these decisions should be made without HSC input. **G. Stewart** is on the Technical Advisory Committee for WTA and sees it as important that the HSC have as much input as possible into their work. He noted that **J. Lundstrom** made an excellent presentation to WTA on who and what the HSC is and what issues and concerns the HSC is addressing. As a result, WTA was made aware of issues they had not as yet known about. **G. Stewart** would like to the HSC Water Transit Work Group look at this and raise the awareness of ferries, the public, etc. **M. Beatie** can bring past knowledge to the group and MSO/VTs are encouraged to also join in the group effort. The work group is asked to report at the next HSC meeting.

HUMAN FACTORS WORK GROUP, S. Merritt. The work group reviewed the propulsion and steering casualty best practices standards of care document. It is out and comments are being received. The work group will have a report for the next HSC meeting.

PREVENTION THROUGH PEOPLE WORK GROUP, M. Brown. The work group hopes to finish its chart work at its next meeting, scheduled for 7-17-01 at the State Lands Office in Hercules at 9:30.

TUG ESCORT WORK GROUP, J. Lundstrom. The work group will coordinate with the Rocks Work Group, so any statements come to the HSC. **J. Lundstrom** will seek input on issues to address. **G. Stewart** once again encouraged as much participation as possible when work groups meet.

L. Korwatch reported that the MX/CH is revamping the mailing list. Give her your business card if you want to be included on the list.

PLAN REVIEW, L. Korwatch. HSC committee members have submitted comments over the last month. Most have been editorial and typos. There are no substantial changes. She is looking to submit the Plan Review to OSPR by the end of the month and suggests the committee approve the Plan Review as written at this meeting. MOTION by **T. Wilson**, seconded by **M. Beatie** that “the HSC approve the Plan Review as presented.” Motion passed unanimously.

PORTS WORK GROUP, A. Steinbrugge. (1) The Benicia meter is back in and working. The plan is to establish a demonstration site sometime in September and the long-term plan is for a side-looking instrument so the cable won't get broken. The Richmond cable is out, after lasting between four and five years. It is scheduled for redeployment the same day as the next HSC meeting. All other equipment is working well. Two salinity meters are in the water and NOAA will begin disseminating data. Creatures climbing into the meters throws off calibration and an effort is being made to find a device to keep them out. (2) **L. Korwatch** reported on the status of PORTS funding. There was some money left in the budget and Boating and Waterways extended the grant for another year. With frugal administration of the funds, she feels the system can be kept going on a patch-it basis. The CH is looking to Sacramento for additional money. Question: Should the HSC send a letter to Boating and Waterways? **L. Korwatch:** Boating and Waterways isn't the problem. It is up to the legislature, which is focused on energy issues. Individuals and companies are encouraged to write to their local legislators to encourage their support for continued PORTS funding. **Assembly Member Carole Migden** will continue to sponsor the project. **M: Beatie:** Boating and Waterways has \$16.8 million in the Harbor Reserve Fund. **L. Korwatch** added that the new Director of Boating and Waterways is supportive of PORTS and she is also hoping NOAA can add some money.

OLD BUSINESS. (1) The chair thanked **J. Lundstrom** for her presentation to WTA regarding who the HSC is and what they do and thanked **D. Kranking** for arranging for WTA staff to tour VTS. (2) **L. Teague** addressed the issue of tankers arriving with masters having no knowledge of the tug escort form and requirements of escorting. This is especially a problem at night in the fog when the pilot needs to stop the ship before coming into the bay to do the necessary paperwork and explain the requirements to the master. Perhaps the MX can take the lead to notify agents again. Question: Are

the ships arriving with their escorts available? **L. Teague**: Yes, but the master has no idea or the escort or the form required. Historically, SF Bay had a lot of regular callers, but lately there have been more spot callers and perhaps agencies are assuming that, because the tug escort regulations are so old, everyone knows about them. Question: How do the pilots handle that situation. **L. Teague**: Individual pilots handle it differently. He advises the MX that the master has not been advised. **L. Korwatch** noted that the MX sends an annual letter to agents regarding the requirements. They are setting up the escorts, but dropping the ball on advising the masters. **B. Dorsch** suggested that particular offenders be advised on the event of each offense. **L. Korwatch** to **Peter McIsaac**, President of the San Francisco Bar Pilots; can the pilots be asked to report to the MX each time this happens? **P. McIsaac**: Yes, and then can the MX track it? **G. Stewart**: Can this information be captured for the CH Report? **L. Korwatch**: Yes, a log can be kept for each ship and a mechanism can be developed to tag these vessels and report to the HSC. **M. Brown**: Escort forms should be included with the letter when individuals are contacted to say they are not complying with the regulations. **E. Dohm** to **B. Dorsch**: Can this be added to vetting? **B. Dorsch**: It's part of the agent's job to communicate with the vessels. **L. Teague**: The real issue is the need to maneuver and kill time when the vessel arrives unprepared. Question: Who isn't doing their job, is it specific agents. **E. Dohm**: It is random across the board for new callers. Question: How many of last month's 73 calls involved this problem? **E. Dohm**: A handful. Question: What about the *Guide to Port Entry*? It contains all the information a master needs regarding each port. It's a question of the agent's responsibility versus the master's responsibility to open the book occasionally. **L. Teague**: It only happens occasionally, but it's a big deal when it does, especially in the night in the fog. The intention is to find a good way to advise all masters, not to point blame at anyone, in order to avoid the problem. Question: What if the time for submitting the escort form is changed so that it must be presented electronically or by fax 24 hours before arrival? **A. Steinbrugge** asked for clarification on exactly what the HSC wants the CH to track, when a master is completely unaware of the regulations or when he doesn't have the escort form. The Chair responded "both". **S. Merritt** added that the HSC should be careful not to put the pilot in a regulatory enforcement role, which would be bad for bridge management and defeats the goals of the master-pilot relationship. **A. Steinbrugge**: The CH report will include the numbers, not individual names. **L. Teague**: Proper notification is more important than counting random incidents. It's not necessary to name who. The Navigation Work Group will look at the issue of form submission requirements. **J. Lundstrom** disagreed, stating that who is as important as what. Question: When a vessel makes the four-hour pre-arrival call, can the SFBP dispatcher verify that the form has been completed? **J. Mes** stressed that too big a deal is being made of this. It's just a matter of new people and the MX reinforcing the need for the escort form when a vessel calls in its displacement. The Chair directed the MX to send out a reminder letter and to track information, for a few months, on when vessels don't have the form or are unaware of the requirements.

NEW BUSINESS: **L. Teague** expressed the concern that the offshore anchorage is being used to avoid additional tug escort fees. **E. Dohm** suggested that, when a vessel's berth is not available, it would avoid two escort charges by going to Anchorage 9 and paying the stand-by charge. It was pointed out that, by staying offshore, the vessel also avoids incurring the charges for shoreside shuttles for the crew. **M. Beatie** to **D. Kranking**: With the new AIS, can VTS put an alarm ring around a vessel offshore? **E. Dohm**: VTS did detect the vessel dragging anchor. **D. Kranking**: Vessels in the offshore anchorage are plotted electronically. Question: Is the use of the offshore anchorage seasonal? **E. Dohm**: No, it's a year-round monetary issue. The agencies support the pilots and want the vessels safely in the bay, but they work for the owners/charterers who are concerned with saving money. **D. Kranking**: Hopefully, there is technology on the ship so they can plot an alarm ring because it usually takes more than one call to convince a vessel that they are drifting and dragging anchor. Question: Is there any indication that there has been a lack of proper anchor watch? **D. Kranking**: There is no information to indicate that. A vessel in the offshore anchorage is in the inshore sector regarding which channel to monitor. Not all vessels seem to be aware of this. **E. Dohm** reported that there is a meeting of vessel operators and pilots directly after this HSC meeting to address the issue of use of the offshore anchorage among other subjects.

The next HSC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 7-12-01 at 10:00 at the Port of Oakland.

MOTION to adjourn by **M. Brown**, seconded by **B. Dorsch**. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 1135.

Respectfully submitted,

Captain Lynn Korwatch
Executive Secretary