

**Minutes
HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE
of the San Francisco Bay Region**

**9:00 a.m., Thursday, July 16, 1992
Board Room, Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman, A. Thomas, at 0915. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: Dave Adams, Port of Oakland; James Faber, Port of Richmond; Roger Peters, Port of San Francisco; Alexander Krygsman, Port of Stockton; Joseph Gaidick, Port of Benicia; Margo Brown, National Boating Federation; Dwight Koops, Exxon Shipping; Gunnar Lundeberg, Sailors Union of the Pacific; James Macaulay, Harbor Tug and Barge Company; Gail Skarich, Sanders Towboat Company; Ann Nothoff, Natural Resources Defense Council; Joan Lundstrom, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Max Blodgett, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and federal government members Captain J. M. MacDonald and CMDR Thomas P. Dolan, U. S. Coast Guard. Also in attendance from OSPR R. Dunstan, C. Raysbrook, and B. Leland. There were also many attendees from the general public.

2. The Chair welcomed committee members and those attending from the interested public. T Hunter noted that a quorum was present.

3. R. Dunstan introduced Chuck Raysbrook, newly appointed Deputy Administrator, and Bob Sands, who heads the Planning Unit.

4. The minutes of the previous meeting were corrected as follows: Para. 32, the resolution to be sent to "Washington, D. C." not Sacramento; Para. 34, should be amended to clarify that the bridge discussed by M. Goebel is the "Benicia-Martinez Bridge, it was moved, seconded and passed unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

5. At the request of J. MacDonald, the Coast Guard Harbor Report was moved to the top of the agenda. He introduced Chief Steve Attaway, who will take over for Chief Carl Young who is going to work for Fish and Game. S. Attaway will serve as pilotage coordinator and will be working on the Williams Study. Mark Steinhilber will replace Bill Carey.

6. A Notice of Proposed Rule Making has come out as a result of OP 90. It requires a tug escort in Prince William Sound and Puget Sound for vessels of 5,000 gross tons or greater. Input for other areas is solicited. The deadline for comments is September 8, 1992. P. Dolan noted that regulations are coming out specific to ferry disasters and response to them. There are draft regulations for herring boats and representatives from VTS and MSO will meet to coordinate better control of boats and nets.

7. There have been eight spills since the last meeting. Two involved fishing vessels, the first was minor and the second involved 50 gallons. With 800 gallons aboard, it could have been more serious. There was a 100 gallon spill involving sodium hydroxide from the USS SHASTA at Samoa. The problem with a chemical spill of this type is that when you have sulfuric acid and hydrocarbons burning you can't use water. In this case foam was used and none of the substance reached the water. The Regional Response Team will meet to look at what can be done with sulfonated atoms and the resultant sludge.

8. Cmdr. Steinhilber noted that the next step in the development of a Port Area Committee as mandated by OP 90 is to set up a meeting with the state and ask that the state serve as Vice Chair for the committees to align philosophies and duties under OP 90 and SB 2040.

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
July 16, 1982

9.D. Adams asked if there was a record of a spill from a crack in the hull of the DSR YOKOHAMA. J. MacDonald responded that there was. It was difficult to get in to make repairs without moving ballast. The fuel tank was emptied and filled with water. The crack was repaired by welding on a metal plate. This had to be done under water and due to the efforts of the repair team less than a gallon was lost.

10.The committee was advised that, despite a reduction in overall VTS budgeting, the San Francisco area upgrades do not appear to be in jeopardy. MOTION by A. Nothoff that the committee write to the appropriate congressional committee to reinsert money for VTS into the budget, with a copy of the correspondence to go to state representatives. She noted that upgrading VTS and supporting the Coast Guard in this effort is a major component of the harbor safety plan. The motion was seconded by J. Lundstrom. The Chair requested that R. Dunstan advise the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor Safety Committee to consider doing the same thing so the entire west coast is involved. It was at the instigation of the Coast Guard that efforts to establish a privately supported VTS were put aside. The Coast Guard's position was that they were the more appropriate entity to establish, upgrade and maintain vessel traffic systems. The Chair accepted the motion without dissent and considered it to be passed unanimously.

11.PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE, A. Nothoff. A. Nothoff distributed a copy of those sections of the plan the sub-committee feels are ready to be adopted by committee vote. She suggested that the committee begin to adopt those recommendations from the draft plan that are in final language. Recommendations regarding tug escorts are still evolving. VTS recommendations are being updated with newer Coast Guard language. Sub-committee reports regarding small vessel traffic and under keel clearance will come to the full committee in August. Those sections of the plan that are relatively complete are Section I, Geographic Boundaries; Section III, Harbor Conditions; Section V, Vehicular Bridge Management; and Section VII, Communications. She asked the responsible sub-committee chairs to introduce each section and place them on the floor for a vote to adopt the language and recommendations as proposed. A. Krygsman requested that documents of this type be received by committee members at least one week before being presented at a meeting for consideration to be voted upon.

12.J. Lundstrom responded that the first recommendations, numbers 3 and 4, appear on p. 29 and have not been changed since June. She suggested starting the adoption process with votes on these sections that are unchanged. A. Krygsman asked why the committee should adopt the plan a piece at a time rather than as a complete document. J. Lundstrom responded that the Plan Sub-Committee recommends getting areas without controversy adopted. J. Gaidisick asked if the full plan will actually be ready in August. A. Nothoff answered that it would. The tug escort issue is the toughest and that area will be targeted after the next Plan Sub-Committee meeting.

13.The INTRODUCTION to the plan was the first section taken from the table for discussion. J. Macaulay noted that appendices were cited with reference numbers left blank. A. Nothoff responded that three new appendices were stated for inclusion at the last sub-committee meeting, including the San Francisco Bar Pilots' Port Safety Guidelines. They are all relevant and important; the names are in the language, the numbers are not so important in terms of adopting the section. G. Skarich asked about the reference to "either/or" in the listing of tankers appendix. A. Nothoff responded that there has been a financial problem at the Marine Exchange and it is a question of which they will be able to produce for the plan. T. Hunter added that, at this time, the Exchange is able to produce either. The Chair noted a preference for the listing of tankers that called in the last year with their deadweight and flag noted. The committee voted unanimously and the introduction was ADOPTED as written.

14.SECTION I, GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES. A. Krygsman stated that the law (SB 2040) states what is defined as marine waters. This committee cannot redefine the term. The plan as drafted is inconsistent with the law by stating that marine waters extend to Sacramento and Stockton. A. Nothoff responded that P. Bontadelli has said that the definition used in the plan is better. A. Krygsman reiterated that it is inconsistent with law and read the definition from SB 2040, p. 14. J. Macaulay suggested that the draft language in the plan could be "cleaned up" to conform with the law. R. Dunstan stated that the Administrator has the authority to use a more flexible definition than the one in SB 2040. Technically, the plan should address the definition in statute. However, if the committee

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
July 16, 1992

thinks an area should be expanded upon, such as it did with the dredging issue, it can so state in the plan and the Administrator will review the additions. J. Lundstrom suggested additional language stating that the expanded definition is being used "for the purposes of the Harbor Safety Plan." J. Macaulay suggested leaving the definition of marine waters as stated in SB 2040 and state in the plan that the committee feels the geographical boundaries should include the area from the county line to the ports of Stockton and Sacramento. The committee accepted J. Macaulay's suggestion and the section was ADOPTED unanimously.

15. SECTION III, A; CHANNEL DESIGN AND DREDGING. D. Adams voiced accord with the section as written, as long as the language stating "present depth" at the Port of Oakland is deleted. He deferred to J. Lundstrom for further discussion on the section. J. Lundstrom reported that the language added on p. 28 gives rationale and outlines the reasons why dredging is recommended. Recommendations #3 and #4 were received by the committee at the February, 1992 meeting. J. Lundstrom added that if the committee will vote on adoption of these two recommendations she would like a discussion. J. Lundstrom stated that the Bay Commission (BCDC) at a regular meeting had discussed the issue of lowering the underwater rocks off Alcatraz as outlined in Recommendation #3. The Commission expressed its concern that blasting to lower the rocks might have a negative effect on fish habitat in the Bay and that this should be studied by the State Department of Fish and Game. This proposal would need permit approval from the Commission. J. Macaulay stated the opinion that these are recommendations of the Harbor Safety Committee and that to add language addressing permitting processes and BCDC will muddy the waters. A. Nothoff noted that it is implicit that each recommendation must go through environmental review before implementation. She added that if the committee so chose, it could be made explicit. J. Macaulay responded that the committee does not need the BCDC position in the plan. Like VTS or racons recommendations, recommendations #3 and #4 will go through the permitting process. J. Lundstrom stated that BCDC does not want their representative to go on record as voting in support of these two controversial recommendations without the added language. D. Koops suggested that maybe concerns like this can come through the implementation and enforcement sections of the plan. A. Krygsman added that he believes J. Lundstrom's intent is to have the BCDC language on record. J. Macaulay stated that these are committee recommendations for safety. A tanker on a rock creates an environmental hazard. D. Adams stated that, throughout the plan, the method of carrying out recommendations is not the issue. The plan is not a "how to" manual but what should happen. These are recommendations for navigational safety. J. Dabbar, ARCO, stated that the Los Angeles-Long Beach committee had the same questions. He referred to a letter to the LA-LB committee from P. Bontadelli, dated June 3, 1992, which stated that OSPR would coordinate with state and federal authorities/agencies for implementation. J. MacDonald noted that recommendation #3 is a long term project. The Coast Guard has requested an interim racon on Harding Rock. Every day 100,000 gallons of crude passes by the rock. A racon is a short term solution; the long term solution would a bigger buoy for the racon, however, the bigger buoy would be harder to handle in currents. R. Dunstan added that the June letter from P. Bontadelli to the LA-LB committee referred to earlier also came to this committee. The Administrator will weigh the environmental effects of each recommendation and might oppose certain of them. J. Lundstrom, as the BCDC representative went on record as wanting the position of the Bay Commission regarding Recommendations #3 and #4 to be included in the implementation and enforcement section. RECOMMENDATION #3 was ADOPTED. Recommendation #4 was ADOPTED.

16. SECTION V, VEHICULAR BRIDGE MANAGEMENT and SECTION VII, NAVIGATIONAL BRIDGE MANAGEMENT. D. Koops noted that these two sections are fairly non-controversial and informational in nature. The language has been out and remained unchanged for six months except for the addition of the Antioch and Rio Vista Bridges. The recommendations are fairly straight-forward and their implementation would increase safety. RECOMMENDATIONS #12 - #17 were ADOPTED. RECOMMENDATIONS #21 and #22 have been unchanged since earlier this year. D. Koops noted that teamwork and team training on the bridge are recognized as important. Bridge to bridge communication and VTS were added. J. Macaulay stated that OPA 90 spells out a new channel for communication. J. MacDonald responded that it is not in OPA 90; 22A (the new channel) is not mandatory to all vessels. RECOMMENDATIONS #21 AND #22 were ADOPTED.

17. TUG ESCORT SUB-COMMITTEE, R. Peters. R. Peters updated the committee on the activity of the sub-committee since the last full committee meeting. The Allen study was received on July 6 and is 60 pages long.

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
July 16, 1992

The sub-committee has not had time to fully review it and make recommendations. The sub-committee's interest has been and continues to be the improvement of safety and the adequate study of a science based formula relating bollard pull to deadweight. The interim formula for bollard pull has been removed from the recommendations. The committee recommends changing the language so that the minimum standard ration for tugs is 1-1 rather than 1-2. The sub-committee would like to set a deadline of 10/31/92 for final science based rules and recommends that the committee request OSPR establish a separate rule making process to implement final science based rules for a bollard pull formula.

18.D. Arnett suggested the committee sit down and figure out once and for all exactly what it is we want tugs to do. Do we want to "lasso a raging bull and drag it to a stop?" First the question of what are we asking of tugs should be answered and then the issue can be analyzed. This committee may have given the consultant the wrong impression. Should a tug have the pull to stop a vessel within ten of its lengths or keep it on course. J. MacDonald asked if the science based rules will address speed. Bollard pull is unrelated to speed of the vessel or position of the tug. R. Peters responded that it is the intent of the sub-committee to address all variables. M. Glazer asked if there will be more meetings to discuss these issues. R. Peters answered that it is the intent of the sub-committee that the recommendations be accepted and then a schedule be developed. J. Macaulay asked about the formula that is found on p. 63 of the June version of the plan. A ratio of 1-1, bollard pull to deadweight tonnage of the vessel is more in line with current practices. In Puget Sound they use a ratio 3-4 times the current practice here. B. Capasso applauds the change to a 1-1 ration and agrees with D. Arnett that the committee needs to define exactly what it wants a tug to do. In the meantime he would like to see the committee address voluntary compliance with the interim guidelines/recommendations. A. Nothoff agreed that it is the intent of SB 2040 to address tug escorts in an expeditious manner. D. Koops cautioned the committee not to just say "have tug escorts"; the interim product should be more explicit. The Chair asked R. Dunstan if it is feasible to submit the entire plan as written while the Tug Escort Sub-Committee could work with the full committee on tug escort recommendations. Interim regulations could not be implemented in time unless maybe as emergency regulations. The Chair asked R. Dunstan if OSPR, since they have access, could press the state government to request voluntary compliance. In 1978 99% compliance with VTS was achieved voluntarily. J. Lundstrom noted that the Interim Guidelines were accepted 3/12/92 and are in the plan. The committee should first receive the change in language to double the bollard pull/deadweight ratio from 1-2 to 1-1. A. Krygman stated that this concept was heard by the committee for the first time five minutes ago and the committee cannot adopt what the public doesn't know about. J. Macaulay responded that interim guidelines do not require public comment. J. Sides, Seaway Transportation, stated that the *Allen report is one man's opinion; it may be ill-advised to proceed without a second opinion.* The Chair stated that the Tug Escort Sub-Committee had made no move for adoption of the full Allen study.

19.V. Backen, Bay and Delta, speaking for J. Frost, stated that more studies should be taken. He read from a letter to the committee from J. Frost in which he volunteered his tugs and services to get hard concrete physical evidence of what can be done here. Two tugs with the bollard pull capacity equal to a single tug would be more effective. D. Koops noted that the Tug Escort Sub-Committee has not worked in a vacuum and has used the results of tests already conducted on the Bay. M. Goebel stated that he spoke with R. Allen and some data has been captured in the study. If we ask industry to comply voluntarily we must ask, comply with what? The committee should have a final product to be professional. The Chair stated that a product, the Tug Escort Interim Guidelines, were adopted, sent to Sacramento and included in the plan. The only change to those guidelines is in the formula for matching tugs to vessels. A. Nothoff asked if the tug escort section and the full plan could meet later, with the upgraded escort recommendations treated as emergency regulations to catch up with the plan in the regulatory process. R. Dunstan noted that there can be emergency regulations; a case must be made with the Office of Administrative Law. He doesn't understand the concern with catching up. Many elements of the plan will happen at different rates. A. Nothoff asked what is given up to get emergency regulations. R. Dunstan answered that there is no public review, but the interim guidelines were submitted after comment was received at a public workshop. J. Faber stated that you can't find a more democratic forum than this committee has been and now people are "coming out of the wall". If there are comments they should be addressed to the next workshop. A. Nothoff asked if, as this develops, the full committee should look at the issue of tug escorts and restructure the format or, would the committee rather continue with the sub-committee structure. J. Faber noted that everyone on the full committee is welcome at sub-committee meetings. D. Arnett asked if the committee would like to form a technical advisory group to do

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region

July 16, 1992

risk analysis with a variety of scenarios. J. Macaulay stated that these issues have been beat to death. The sub-committee has gotten the opinions of pilots, tanker operators and tug operators. D. Arnett responded that work has not been done with actual scenarios nor has the consultant been given a description of what needs to be done by a tug escort. M. Brown stated that, while the sub-committee is not lacking for input, it is not always timely. Those with comments should see to it that their comments are received in good time and they should attend the sub-committee meetings. J. Dabbar, ARCO, stated that real live testing is okay but, if industry were to try to comply, it is not clear what is wanted. It needs to be explicitly stated, as it is for Puget Sound. The Chair noted that ARCO did not dissent with the interim guidelines and asked if that means that ARCO would comply with them. J. Dabbar responded yes.

20. M. Glazer stated that the public and the operators don't know what the sub-committee has looked at. It would help to have a general list of what has been considered. She supports doubling the ratio for matching tugs to tankers which brings things more in line with Puget Sound. She asked about the status of bollard pull testing and certification. T. Hunter responded that bollard pull testing could start in two weeks if necessary. Certification and training of crews has been discussed with the California Maritime Academy. P. Moloney added that CMA has no formal tasking on crew training and certification, they have been waiting for direction. The Chair sees this as a complex issue and wouldn't like to see it hold up the elements of the plan that would improve safety. J. Lundstrom stated that it would be helpful to see the rationale, background record of discussion and data and an explanation of why the sub-committee reached its conclusions. R. Dunstan stated that the interim guidelines were forwarded to the Administrator and have been commented upon. The next step is a public workshop with the full committee. He has held off on that because of the possibility that the interim guidelines would be superseded by the plan, but it doesn't appear that this will happen. D. Koops stated that it is time for tug escort to be more structured. It has been very democratic and now tightening things up is how you come to the end. The Chair stated that the committee has two items of action to consider (1) to change the language in the plan, Section V(G), so that the ratio for tugs to vessels is 1-1 rather than 1-2 and (2) the suggestion that workshops be scheduled so the state, through OSPR, can move ahead with the interim guidelines.

21. J. Gaidnick MOVED and J. Macaulay seconded that the language in the plan be changed to double the bollard pull requirement. A. Notthoff asked how doubling the ratio compares to what is in place in Washington. D. Koops responded that it puts it closer, but still under. The Chair stated that he doesn't want to offend anyone but when companies sell their tugs based on horsepower, it's not always what is in the engine room. What we are proposing here comes close to Washington and may even exceed. J. Macaulay suggested that the sentence, "This formula was derived from a 1979 U. S. Coast Guard Proposed Rule Making," be changed to read, "This formula doubles what was derived . . ." D. Hobue, Foss Maritime Company, stated that you can convert horsepower to bollard pull by multiplying by 24 or 25. The Chair responded that the suggested conversion multiplier has ranged between 21 and 25. That is why the Tug Escort Sub-Committee recommends bollard pull testing. M. Brown called for the question. The unanimous decision was to double the ratio for matching tugs to vessels.

22. The second recommendation of the sub-committee is that a deadline of 10-31-92 be set for determining science based rules for a bollard pull and tug escort specifications. G. Lundeberg asked if this should be done by the sub-committee or the full committee. A. Krygman responded that the Chair can so order and it doesn't need a vote. A. Notthoff suggested developing a schedule of what will happen between now and 10-31-92. The Chair stated that the sub-committee has volunteered to continue working and asked that committee members attend. He would like to formalize dates for meetings. R. Peters responded that the sub-committee was not prepared to submit a schedule. J. Gaidnick suggested that R. Peters give a schedule of meetings and deadlines to the Marine Exchange for distribution when it is prepared.

23. The Chair stated that the interim guidelines went to Sacramento as adopted and are in the plan. When October 31, 1992, recommendations come, they will be addressed. R. Dunstan instructed the committee to forward the revision to the Administrator and begin the review process. If the plan is to follow shortly, the plan and the tug escort recommendations can go together, otherwise they can be treated separately. The Chair stated the belief that it is the intention of this committee to adopt the rest of the plan at the August meeting. B. Capasso asked the

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
July 16, 1982

effect of doubling the bollard pull ratio without implementation. The issue is what does the committee want. The committee knows the issues. The tug operators are at this meeting because they want to know what is wanted. The Chair responded that this is not a regulatory agency; OSPR is the regulatory agency. J. Dabbar asked if the committee is going to ask for emergency regulations of voluntary compliance. The Chair stated that he reads the committee to want voluntary compliance until regulations are in place. R. Dunstan added that, if the committee sends a request today, we could have a public meeting at the next meeting of the full committee in August and regulations in place in 60 days.

24.MOTION by A. Krygsman and second by J. Macaulay to forward the amended ratio language to the Administrator and request that OSPR act on the recommendations in the interim tug escort guidelines and move forward without completion of the full plan. J. Lundstrom suggested adding voluntary industry compliance language. A. Krygsman responded that industry can't comply without OSPR action. M. Goebel asked if the committee is asking industry to comply with guidelines that are still in the workshop phase. The Chair responded that the interim guidelines have been forwarded to Sacramento and are a part of the plan until October when the recommendations from the sub-committee will be received. When adopted they will go to Sacramento to replace the interim guidelines. A. Nothoff asked if a paragraph could be added to say how this will happen. M. Brown stated that this is not germane to the question. The Chair agreed. R. Peters called for the question. The question was reread and the committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

25.A. Nothoff reiterated the request to include a statement that revised recommendations would follow. G. Waitz, IBU, stated that "interim" means that something will follow. G. Skarich asked if the sub-committee would distribute copies of comments from other sources since the Frost letter was read to the meeting. R. Peters responded yes. R. Peters noted that the committee has dealt with three of the sub-committees recommendations which leaves the fourth which deals with the issue of voluntary compliance. He noted that there are two schools of thought on when industry should be requested to comply voluntarily, now to the interim guidelines or after there is a more fleshed out set of guidelines. A. Krygsman stated that you can't ask industry to comply with something OSPR may not agree with and the committee should wait to request voluntary compliance until OSPR is in accord. J. Macaulay referred to an OSPR Bulletin which stated that ten companies had voluntarily agreed to stay at least 50 miles out at sea until they are ready to start their approach to a port. This committee has the power to recommend to OSPR that they request voluntary compliance. In fact, some companies are already in compliance voluntarily. J. Faber asked if the committee should ask for voluntary compliance now or wait for a more formal product. J. Macaulay stated that the Tug Escort Sub-Committee has worked hard and has a product that the committee can ask OSPR to request that companies comply with voluntarily.

26.MOTION by A. Krygsman and seconded by J. Lundstrom that the Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region request OSPR to request voluntary compliance with the interim tug escort guidelines as soon as OSPR determines they are acceptable. D. Arnett asked how long it take for OSPR to come out with the request. R. Dunstan responded that there will be a workshop in 30 days plus time for evaluation. This will still be faster than adoption of emergency regulations. A. Nothoff suggested an amendment to the motion to say that as soon as OSPR agrees to the interim guidelines they will request voluntary compliance. M. Goebel stated that industry has a history of working with groups like this and this committee has the respect of industry which would lead to voluntary compliance. G. Waitz asked if this committee can ask for voluntary compliance. A. Nothoff stated that she wants to avoid the guidelines becoming a moving target. A. Krygsman called for the question. The motion passed unanimously.

27.PILOTAGE SUB-COMMITTEE, A. Krygsman. The sub-committee will meet in the Board Room of the Port of San Francisco at the end of July or early August to address pilotage safety and under keel clearance. The sub-committee will entertain public comments as each issue is raised, rather than all at the end of the meeting.

28.J. Faber asked about the rules for crew training and certification. J. Macaulay would like the committee to ask the Marine Exchange to move forward with bollard pull measurements. Before CMA or the Marine Exchange

**Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
July 16, 1992**

can move on training and certification the committee must determine what is wanted/needed. Currently, tug companies comply with Coast Guard rules regarding training of crews. J. Faber stated that perhaps this committee dropped the ball on certification since the interim guidelines state that Fish and Game will be responsible for certification. R. Dunstan stated that the situation here is the same as that for the interim guidelines as a whole. Fish and Game is waiting for a workshop and would like it to coincide with the August 13, 1992, full Harbor Safety Committee meeting. G. Skarich asked if Fish and Game is going to come up with crew certification requirements and will they be outlines at the August 13 meeting. R. Dunstan responded that at that meeting Fish and Game will have the recommendations of this committee and will receive public comment. B. Clinton, Crowley Maritime, stated that it is important to have an even playing field, not a situation where one company does a three day training program and another sends a tape home. R. Peters referred to p. 68 of the draft plan of 6/18/92. CMA has indicated that they can provide training. The sub-committee see it as the job of Fish and Game/OSPR to set up a training and certification process. It is this committee's role to state some of the requirements of training.

29. NEW BUSINESS. The Chair stated that the secretariat, the Marine Exchange, is unable to proceed. The state's budget problems have resulted in non-payment of the Marine Exchange's expenses to date. The Marine Exchange is a non-profit organization and has depleted its operating funds in service to the state and this committee. For the state to expect the Marine Exchange to bank roll well in excess of \$20,000 to do work mandated by the state is patently ridiculous. The Chair asked the OSPR representatives present to carry the message back to Sacramento that the Chair is profoundly displeased and that committee members are chagrined at the situation. It is the voluntary efforts of the members of this committee at some personal sacrifice that has produced the draft plan. The committee is sad to be part of OSPR if it is to have a reputation of being unwilling to pay its sub-contractors. R. Dunstan responded that OSPR has no control over the budget. He thanked the Marine Exchange for its patience and flexibility in a difficult situation.

30. D. Luce, Bay and Delta Tugs, asked if bollard pull testing can begin now. The Chair stated that the Marine Exchange can not be expected to cover the cost. D. Luce responded that he understands that the tug companies will pay the cost of testing, as they did in Los Angeles/Long Beach. T. Hunter stated that the Marine Exchange had been waiting for the Allen report because tug companies do not want to pay to test tugs that may be declared inadequate. Now that there is a 1-1 ratio amendment, testing can go forward. Insurance requirements must be met and the necessary paperwork generated. G. Skarich asked when and where. T. Hunter responded in Richmond in a minimum of two weeks.

31. R. Dunstan stated that the legislature has acted to cut a number of advisory committees from the budget. The harbor safety committees are not included in these cuts and it is not expected that it would happen. The state needs the committees to do the work mandated in SB 2040. D. Koops asked what it could cost to run these committees. The out-of-pocket from the state is minimal. The Chair stated that, if the state bankrupts and disbands this committee, the committee will go back into the Marine Exchange Harbor Safety Committee and continue its work.

32. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 13, 1992, in the Board Room of the Port of San Francisco at 9:30 a.m. Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Hunter
Executive Secretary

