HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SF BAY REGION
Thursday, September 12, 2002
Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA

Grant Stewart of American Ship Management, Chair, called the public meeting to order at 10:00 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; John Davey, Port of San Francisco; Tom Wilson, Port of Richmond; Capt. John Karakoulaklis (alternate for Stuart McRobbie), SeaRiver Maritime; Scott Merritt, Foss Maritime; Michael Beatie, Golden Gate Bridge District, Ferry Division; Capt. Eric Dohm (alternate for Capt. Larry Teague), San Francisco Bar Pilots; Capt. Margaret Reasoner, Crowley Maritime Services; Joan Lundstrom, Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Margo Brown, National Boating Federation; and Kathryn Zagzebski, The Marine Mammal Center. Also present were U. S. Coast Guard representatives, Capt. Larry Hereth and Lt. Cmdr. John Caplis (MSO); CDR David Kranking (VTS); U. S. Army Corps of Engineers representative, David Dwinell; OSPR representative, Al Storm; and CDR Steve Thompson, NOAA representative. In addition, more than ten representatives of the interested public were present.

The Secretariat confirmed the presence of a quorum.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of the 8-8-02 meeting. L. Cardoza: page 1, spelling of Roger Golden’s name; page 4, line 7, should read David Patterson; and page 6, line 11, should read Fassler-Katz. D. Kranking: page 1, COTP’s Report, line 6, ‘area’ should read ‘are’. The comments attributed to D. Kranking should indicate three separate incidents, rather than one. The text in the middle of the paragraph should read as follows, “As noted in the COTP’s Report, there was an incident involving a collision in the past month. However, on a positive note, in a separate situation that occurred west of Pt. Reyes, a fishing vessel called VTS concerned about a container ship bearing down on it. Visibility was less than one nautical mile. VTS put the two vessels in contact with one another and they made safe maneuvering arrangements. In another case Unfortunately, due to communications problems, the two vessels beyond the Precautionary Area did not pass one another as arranged, but did pass at a safe distance. The Ports and Waterways Safety System coming in the next couple of years will may include an additional radar site at Pt. Reyes. A. Storm: page 2, the correct acronym is WSPA.

MOTION by J. Lundstrom, seconded by S. Merritt, to approve the minutes as corrected.

In opening comments, the Chair reported that the HSC Summit held last Monday was very constructive. The meeting was attended by California HSC chairs and the Administrator of OSPR. The group reviewed outstanding recommendations from all committees. Related documents will be distributed at the next meeting of this HSC. The group will meet again in the
fall. The September issue of *Popular Science* includes a good article on security, with a paragraph on PORTS that **L. Hereth** and **A. Steinbrugge** contributed to.

**USCG COTP’S REPORT.** (1) **L. Hereth** reported that, in connection with PORTS, Lynn Korwatch recently hosted a meeting with the new Director of NOAA, attended by USCG and San Francisco Bar Pilot representatives. The discussion was positive and the Director indicated that he would help get support for PORTS. (2) **J. Caplis** reported on port operations statistics for pollution response and investigations and significant port safety events for the period August 1, 2002 through August 31, 2002. A written report is made a part of these minutes. (3) In connection with the anniversary of September 11, 2001 attacks and possible threats, the Homeland Security Advisory System has been raised to level orange, or ‘high’; level four on a five-tiered system. In conjunction, USCG has set the Maritime Security Level to MarSec 2 on its three-tiered scale. USCG presence is ratcheting up, elevating security at facilities, increasing boarding vessels off-shore and putting Sea Marshals on ferries. The off-shore boardings are occurring way off shore, before the pilot station, following national direction for selected vessels. The COTP distributed copies of a Port Security Report, including a threat assessment for marine operations. The dilemma, and a sensitive issue, is that classified information can’t be shared. The question is, ‘what can the port community have?’ A sanitized version of available information can be provided. The Port Security Report, Version 1, distributed here does not include anything that can’t be found in newspapers but has been collected and condensed. **CDR Jeff Seine** will have a principal role, focusing on looking at all the information out there, classified and non-classified, bundling it as appropriate and getting it out. An e-mail list, as used for Version 1, is the fastest way to get information out to a wide range of impacted interests, including vessel operators, marine oil terminal operators and port authorities. The intention is to get everything, up to classified, out ASAP. (4) Technology developed in connection with LUCHENBACH oil recovery operations will be useful in the future. A good level of success has been achieved by heating the viscous oil and then pumping it back into the tanks to liquefy even more oil for removal. Of 130,000 gallons that were remaining, 55,000 gallons were removed by this method. Moving to the next tank, it is expected that another 80,000 gallons will be removed. The project will probably culminate by the end of September. Question: Is the recovered oil useable? **L. Hereth:** Bids are being solicited for recycling. **E. Dohm:** During a fantastic presentation at State Lands’ Prevention First Symposium 2002, Dick Fairbanks reported that technological developments have resulted in reducing the cost of recovery to $300/gallon. He reported that the decision to attempt starboard side recovery under the sand hasn’t been made yet. **L. Hereth:** Would expect the decision to be to continue the process of sealing and capping vents, leaks and cracks. The starboard side tanks are eight feet under the sand. Entombment is the best alternative, otherwise the cost of the operation will increase by millions of dollars and the good summer weather is almost over. **M. Reasoner:** Technology used in the LUCHENBACH recovery effort will be presented at the International Recovery 2002
Conference in Hawaii.  (5) **L. Hereth** apologized for missing the last couple of HSC meetings. Movement on his reassignment to CG headquarters has been going rapidly. He will serve as Director of Coastal Security for the USCG. He thanked everyone in the diverse local maritime community for their work and cooperation. The change of command ceremony is scheduled for 10-8-02.  (6) **J. Caplis** introduced **Greg Phillips**, Port Security Officer since April 2002, who has been instrumental in the success of local cooperative efforts. **L. Hereth** added that **G. Phillips** brings the experience of twenty years with the Santa Rosa police force and a well-rounded CG background.  (7) **D. Kranking** invited everyone from the SF Bay Area maritime community to a reception at VTS at 1200 on 9-20-02 to commemorate the 30th anniversary of VTS. RSVP to **D. Kranking**. On behalf of the HSC, **G. Stewart**, HSC Chair, thanked **L. Hereth** for his service and contributions to the maritime community, which is better off because of his efforts. He will be missed.

**CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT, A. Steinbrugge.** A written report with statistics for the month of August 2002 is made a part of these minutes. There were no calls to OSPR during the month of August for escort violations or vessels without escort paperwork.

**OSPR REPORT, A. Storm.** (1) OSPR commends the USCG for their support of LUCHENBACH oil recovery efforts. (2) The state budget has passed and vendors who have state contracts are in the process of being paid. (3) SB 849 has passed both houses and is on the Governor’s desk. OSPR will be out of the red soon. (4) The application period for the tanker representative vacancy on the SF HSC has closed. **Doug Lathrop**, Chevron Texaco, was the only applicant and will be sworn in at the next HSC meeting. He has indicated that he wants **Pete Bonnebaker**, Phillips 66 Company, to be his alternate. Question: Now that OSPR is flush with funds, will OSPR help fund PORTS? **A. Storm:** It’s too soon to say. The funding will be effective in January 2003. The Administrator is currently reviewing the OSPR budget.

**NOAA REPORT.** None.

**COE REPORT, D. Dwinell.** The text of the COE Report is made a part of these minutes by attachment. Question: Regarding delays to the Avon Turning Basin Project, is one problem that funds are being lost because they have gone unused? **D. Dwinell:** Yes.

**STATE LANDS COMMISSION REPORT, K. Leverich.** (1) There was only one violation at a facility for the month of August and no spills. (2) The Prevention First Symposium in Long Beach was successful, in part because of a collection of good presentations on subjects ranging from ballast water to human factors. The quality of the speakers was outstanding. The proceedings are available on CD. Thanks to **L. Hereth** for continuing the effective partnership between the USCG and State Lands.
PROPOSED LNG OPERATIONS IN VALLEJO, Merv Stromberg. A feasibility study is underway; no proposal is on the table yet. A potential site for unloading and storage tanks has been identified on the south end of Mare Island. The LNG re-gas terminal under consideration could provide 17% of California’s gas needs for 2007. In conjunction with the project, developers are looking at a 600-900 megawatt power plant. Three 950’ LNG carriers per week would serve the facility. LNG is natural gas chilled to −260°F, taking up 1/600 of the space.

LNG is a way of safely carrying natural gas that has a successful safety record worldwide for forty years. The question most-asked is whether the public is at risk from a release. There has never been loss of containment on a vessel. There was one land-based tank rupture in 1944 as the result of a metallurgy problem, which has since been corrected. That incident resulted in the loss of 130 lives and stoppage of operations for a while. Current technology includes double hull tanks with 20’ between the inner and outer walls. On-shore tanks have a 3’ exterior concrete wall, 3’ insulation and a 2” steel liner. The on-going feasibility study will take 4-6 months; followed by a 2-3 year licensing period, during which site clean-up will be conducted. The construction period would be 3 years. Question: Why Mare Island? M. Stromberg: Safe harbor, deep water access and proximity to gas and power distribution systems. Question: Why not Pt. San Pablo, which offers the only deep-water access with no housing nearby? M. Stromberg: Unaware of Pt. San Pablo. Issues for the HSC: (a) Impact on bridges. Boston closes the bridge when LNG carriers pass. The difference here is that there is not the same constrained area of transit. (b) Escorts and exclusion zones. In all existing ports, there are restrictions, exclusion zones, on other vessels in the area of LNG carriers. If this would require shutting down ferry operations for LNG carrier transits, it won’t happen. Recreational boaters will also be vocal on the issue. (c) Dredging. LNG carriers have a 38’ draft. Pinole Shoal is currently at 35’ and would have to be dredged to 40’-42’. Question: Where are other terminals located? Facilities in Everett, Massachusetts, and Lake Charles, Louisiana, have been in operation since the late 1970’s. Facilities in Coat Pt., Maryland, and Elva Is., Savannah, Georgia, were constructed in the 1970’s, closed in the early 1980’s due to contractual disputes and are reopening now. Question: How can the HSC get copies of basic material if the HSC decides to address the project and comment? M. Stromberg: The project is still at the feasibility stage. Project developers would be pleased to provide information to the HSC and accept input. Question: Who is doing the study? M. Stromberg: Shell and Bechtel, the project proponents, are conducting the study to see if the project is technologically and economically feasible and if permits can be obtained. Then will begin the process with the City of Vallejo for site control. The Navy now owns the land, which can be transferred to the city. M. Stromberg suggested that project representatives continue to return to the HSC with updates. Question: Why was the size of the plant cut in half from 1500 to 600-900 megawatts? M. Stromberg: Combining the LNG facility and the power plant, that is the level at which the heat balance works. The LNG facility needs a source of heat to turn LNG back to gas. Using power plant waste heat, versus other options for heating, is the most energy efficient alternative and reduces
environmental impact. Question: Does that result in a considerable difference in project size? **M. Stromberg**: It changes the size of the power plant, not the LNG facility. 6% of the gas coming in will be used at the facility; the rest will go to the state power grid. Question: Will this involve a pipeline at Mare Island? **M. Stromberg**: Yes, options will have to be evaluated. The most likely is to bore under the Carquinez Strait, back up on the south side of the strait, 35’ miles east to Antioch to connect with PG&E. The City of Vallejo is currently putting together a commission to conduct a safety and health study. Question: How many jobs will the proposed project create? **M. Stromberg**: 1,000 peak during construction and 100 during operation. Question: Where is the LNG coming from? **M. Stromberg**: Asia and the Pacific. Alaskan gas is currently contracted to go to Japan. Discussion closed and the Chair asked that the LNG project be added to the agenda as a regular item for update.

**NAVIGATION WORK GROUP REPORT, E. Dohm.** Meetings are on-going with the COE on the issue of receiving charting information electronically and on a timely basis. The COE is currently reformatting their system and SFBP has met with COE to determine what SFBP needs for the new system. The COE’s ultimate goal is to put charts on their website so everyone who can use them has access. The workgroup would like to see them in a format more useable to the maritime community. The Columbia River COE has a website in a very user-friendly format and SF District is going in that direction.

**UNDERWATER ROCKS WORK GROUP REPORT, L. Cardoza.** (1) Congratulations to **L. Hereth** on his well-deserved promotion and thanks for his work on navigational safety and security. (2) Thanks to the HSC for persuading the COE to conduct a maintenance dredging program for the Port of Oakland. **Mike McCormick**, new COE SF District Commander is putting a priority on a regularly scheduled maintenance dredging program. (3) Thanks for work that resulted in the publishing of the pamphlet *Where the Heck is Collinsville?* It has been extremely helpful in education the California Congressional Delegation. (4) Expansion of the Oakland Inner Harbor Turning Basin is going well. All dredged materials are going to beneficial use. (5) The report of the Underwater Rocks workgroup is incorporated into these minutes by attachment. **E. Dohm**: SFBP took the new XO of the COE on an APL vessel transit and it was very successful in giving him a view of local navigational issues.

**FERRY OPERATORS WORK GROUP REPORT, M. Beatie.** (1) A new association, the Bay Area Captains Association, has been formed to address issues of concern to passenger carrying vessel captains. **M. Beatie** read the association’s mission statement into the record: “It is the goal of the Bay Area Captain’s Association to define and promote the legitimate interests of its members to the extent that those interests relate to the safe operation and navigation of passenger carrying vessels. Those interests include, but are not limited to, the safety of passengers and crew; the protection of the environment; the maintenance and care of existing vessels and facilities; the design and construction of new vessels and facilities; the formation and
implementation of rules and regulations by both public and private entities as they pertain to our members and their duties and responsibilities.” M. Beatie will report to the HSC on the activity of the association. (2) The next meeting of the Department of Boating and Waterways will be held September 18-19. M. Beatie will be unable to attend, but has written to the Commissioners, introducing Jeff McCarthy of the MX, who will attend to explain PORTS. With recreational boaters using the system a lot, the department may be a source for on-going funding. L. Korwatch will also attend.

HUMAN FACTORS WORK GROUP. The Chair, G. Stewart, reported that the Safe Transit Program brochure will go into printing and will be out in the next couple of months.

PREVENTION THROUGH PEOPLE WORK GROUP, M. Brown. (1) The meeting scheduled for 9-18-02 has been canceled. The next meeting is scheduled for 10-3-02. (2) The 5,000 copies of Where the Heck is Collinsville? are nearly gone and are being used widely. G. Stewart noted that he recently gave a presentation to a recreational group regarding the HSC and the brochure was well received.

TUG ESCORT WORK GROUP REPORT, J. Lundstrom. The group met at the end of August to continue discussion of the recommendation that vessels carrying dangerous cargo have tug escorts. The notes from that meeting are made a part of these minutes. It is difficult to get a handle on the nature of the trade on SF Bay. He MX provided 2001 figures, using Lloyd’s definition of ‘hazardous cargo’. There were 87 different chemical tanker arrivals at various terminals and the Port of Stockton; 57 different ships; only two arrived four or more times. There were 18 arrivals of LPG carriers, with 9 different ships calling at Sacramento and Stockton. There is no database on the variety of chemicals in the tankers and, with up to 51 different tanks on a ship, there can be a variety of chemicals on each tanker. The workgroup asked the USCG for data on steering and propulsion failures or COTP orders for this category of ship in 2001. There were none. Under the Sea Marshall Program the CG now escorts anhydrous ammonia and LPG tankers and has 96-hour advance notice of cargoes. There is no database tracking these cargoes prior to the institution of the Sea Marshal Program. Most chemical tankers are double hulled. A number of chemical cargoes are carried on petroleum tankers, which are already escorted. Hazardous chemicals are usually carried in center tanks. The next meeting of the workgroup is scheduled for 10-11-02. In summary, it appears that the focus is narrowing down to the most dangerous cargoes. It is possible that the workgroup will rescind its earlier recommendation regarding the tug escorting of all chemical carriers and may recommend support of the Sea Marshal target program.

PORTS FUNDING WORKGROUP, S. Merritt. The MX white paper was out in early August. S. Merritt will draft an executive summary to be distributed by the MX next week. The next step is to contact committee members to determine interests for a letter-writing
lobbying effort and for partial funding by users. The goal is to move to recurring funding versus on-going requests. Potential recurring funding sources are OSPR (tankers); State Lands (terminals) and Boating and Waterways (recreational boaters).

PORTS REPORT, A. Steinbrugge. The Oakland wind sensor tower is up, thanks to help from the Port of Oakland. The sensor should be running tomorrow and NOAA will be validating its data next week. There is no data coming from the Richmond current meter because it is partially buried. There are no funds to dig it out and reposition it. NOAA is moving ahead with a high tech study of a side-looking sensor on the Benicia Bridge. It will be deployed during the first two weeks of November.

OLD BUSINESS. A. Steinbrugge: (1) MTS meeting Thursday, 9-19-02 at 10:00 at Pier 9 Pilot Station. (2) The ports will be approached over the next couple of weeks to reserve rooms and schedule HSC meetings for next year.

NEW BUSINESS. The Chair indicated two items for addition to the October HSC agenda (1) LNG operations status update; and (2) committee members are asked to think about an appreciation program involving formal letters or certificates for those who have made significant contributions to the work of the HSC.

The next meeting of the HSC will be held at 1000 hours at the Port of Richmond on October 10, 2002.

MOTION by M. Brown, seconded by S. Merritt, to “adjourn the meeting.” Motion was passed without objection. Meeting adjourned at 1145.

Respectfully submitted,

Captain Lynn Korwatch
Executive Secretary
USCG Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay
Port Operations Statistics
For 1 to 31 August 2002

PORT SAFETY:

- SOLAS Interventions/COTP Orders: 4
- Propulsion Casualties: 2
- Steering Casualties: 0
- Collisions/Allisions: 0
- Groundings: 1

POLLUTION RESPONSE:

Total oil pollution incidents within San Francisco Bay for the month: 26

- Source Identification; Discharges and Potential Discharges from:
  - Deep Draft Vessels: 0
  - Facilities (includes all non-vessel): 1
  - Military/Public Vessels: 0
  - Commercial Fishing Vessels: 2
  - Other Commercial Vessels: 0
  - Non-Commercial Vessels (e.g. pleasure craft): 15
  - Unknown Source (as of the end of the month): 8

- Spill Volume:
  - Unconfirmed: 10
  - No Spill, Potential Needing Action: 1
  - Spills < 10 gallons: 24
  - Spills 10 to 100 gallons: 1
  - Spills 100 to 1000 gallons: 0
  - Spills > 1000 gallons: 0

Significant Cases:

1 - 31 Aug: S/S JACOB LUCKENBACH Oil recovery operations continue on the shipwreck. Anticipated completion date in late September or early October.

01 Aug: A tug towing a barge with cranes outbound from Matson to sea was detained by VTS at the request of CHP and CALTRANS due to non-notification of bridge owner, the Coast Guard or CALTRANS. Matson provided transit plan and the Golden Gate was cleared of scaffolding. The vessel was allowed to continue on its transit, however the tug/tow had to return due to lashing/rigging problems once it got out to sea. Cranes arrived safely on 02Aug and departed 05Aug after properly securing cranes.

03 Aug: T/V AKADEMIC SEMINOV (CY) while transiting into the Sacramento Deep Water channel, the vessel lost propulsion due to a generator failure and dropped both anchors to control the vessel’s movement. Upon heaving up the port anchor, it was lost within the channel. The vessel regained shaft generator power and was able to return to Pittsburg to effect repairs. A COTP order was issued, ordering the vessel to remain at berth until repairs were made to the satisfaction of class. A separate COTP Order was issued, ordering the anchor be surveyed to be safely out of the channel or recovered (Due to the shallow depth of the channel and the draft of the vessels transiting the channel, the anchor could pose a serious risk of damage to a vessel). Repairs were made to the satisfaction of class on 03Aug and the anchor was recovered on 06Aug. Both COTP Orders were rescinded.
**USCG Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay**

**Port Operations Statistics**

**For 1 to 31 August 2002**

**Significant Cases (Cont.):**

06 Aug: T/V GAZ DIAMOND (PN) was issued a COTP Order to go directly to berth to offload dangerous cargo. COTP Order rescinded on 08Aug upon transfer of cargo.

13 Aug: M/V ROYAL ACCORD (PM) while attempting a 180 degree pivot to moor port-side-to at Diablo Services in Pittsburg, the vessel grounded in N.Y. Slough. After 12 minutes, the vessel moored safely at Diablo Services. Vessel’s equipment was checked and her tanks were sounded; divers checked hull – no damage to vessel or pollution resulted. 2692 submitted.

21 Aug: M/V MIRANDE (FR) while departing U.S. Steel in Pittsburg, vessel experienced engine problems and a loss of propulsion due to misfiring cylinders. Vessel returned to U.S. Steel pier and was issued a COTP Order to remain at berth until repairs have been made after an MSO inspector was not satisfied with attempted repairs. COTP Order rescinded on 22Aug after class society cleared repairs.
San Francisco Bay Region Totals

Tanker arrivals to San Francisco Bay 73 65
Tank ship movements & escorted barge movements 284 341
  Tank ship movements 220 77.46% 217
    Escorted tank ship movements 114 40.14% 99
    Unescorted tank ship movements 106 37.32% 118
  Tank barge movements 64 22.54% 124
    Escorted tank barge movements 30 10.56% 64
    Unescorted tank barge movements 34 11.97% 60

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

Escorts reported to OSPR 0 3

Movements by Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movements by Zone</th>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 2</th>
<th>Zone 4</th>
<th>Zone 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total movements</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unescorted movements</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>50.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ships</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>39.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank barges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort movements</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>49.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ships</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>38.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank barges</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Information is only noted for zones where escorts are required.
2. All percentages are percent of total movements for the zone.
3. Every movement is counted in each zone transited during the movement.
4. Total movements is the total of all unescorted movements and all escorted movements.
# San Francisco Bay Clearinghouse Report For 2002

## San Francisco Bay Region Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanker arrivals to San Francisco Bay</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ship movements &amp; escorted barge movements</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>3,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ship movements</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escorted tank ship movements</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unescorted tank ship movements</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank barge movements</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escorted tank barge movements</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unescorted tank barge movements</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

## Escorts reported to OSPR

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escorts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Movements by Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movements by Zone</th>
<th>Zone 1 %</th>
<th>Zone 2 %</th>
<th>Zone 4 %</th>
<th>Zone 6 %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total movements</td>
<td>45.61%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>46.80%</td>
<td>46.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unescorted</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>47.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>46.80%</td>
<td>46.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ships</td>
<td>33.60%</td>
<td>34.24%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td>33.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank barges</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.37%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escorted</td>
<td>54.39%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53.20%</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank ships</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>52.31%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53.20%</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank barges</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>17.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Information is only noted for zones where escorts are required.
2. All percentages are percent of total movements for the zone.
3. Every movement is counted in each zone transited during the movement.
4. Total movements is the total of all unescorted movements and all escorted movements.
Harbor Safety Committee
Of the San Francisco Bay Region

Report of the
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District

September 12, 2002

1. CORPS 2002 O&M DREDGING PROGRAM

   a. **Main Ship Channel** – Dredging complete – Project completed for this year

   b. **Richmond Outer and Southampton** – Project completed for this year

   c. **Richmond Inner** – Corps has awarded contract and given the notice to proceed. Dredging should start shortly. All material is going to the ocean.

   d. **Oakland (Inner & Outer)** – Corps awarded contract to Dutra and dredging is underway

   e. **Suisun Bay Channel** - Essayons completed this project at the end of June, material was disposed at SF-16. Corps held meeting with the pilots to discuss their concerns about depths in some portions of this project. The Corps’ dredge Yaquina is scheduled to dredge Bulls Head and Point Edith the 1st or 2nd of October.

   f. **San Rafael** – This is a congressional addition to the Corps budget – In-Bay/Winter Island Disposal. When the sediment testing was performed elevated levels of Chlordane and DDT were found. The DMMO agencies have agreed to let the Corps take Composites 1 & 2 to Winter Island and the other composites in bay (i.e. Alcatraz). The Corps should award the contract by the end of September. Corps is also consulting with the services to try to extend the dredging window for this project. Should complete by the end of December.

   g. **Petaluma** – This is a congressional addition to the Corps budget – Upland Disposal. There is a problem with the disposal site that the Fish and Wildlife Service and City are in the process of resolving. Scheduled bid opening has been delayed until these issues are resolved. Corps is in the process of consulting on the environmental dredging windows with the anticipated completion of the project by the end of November.

   h. **Larkspur** – In-Bay Disposal at Alcatraz. Anticipate a late start because of environmental window in one location of the channel. Corps has awarded the contract of EAI International and the notice to proceed should be given by September 13, 2002. Condition survey has been completed and there is
approximately 120,000 cubic yards to dredge. Project is scheduled to complete by late October.

i. Redwood City – Project was completed June 30, 2002. However, shoaling has occurred in a project reach that was accepted as complete in December 2001. A 28.5 ft. channel depth operation limit has been placed by the Bar Pilots. The Corps is coordinating with the Bar Pilots to address the shoaled channel area.

2. DEBRIS REMOVAL

The total tonnage of debris collected on the San Francisco Bay for August 2002 was approximately 62 tons. This is up from the 27 tons for July.

3. UNDERWAY OR UPCOMING HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

a. Oakland 50-ft – Status unchanged - Corps is waiting to see how much money will be in next year’s budget.
Construction is underway. Corps has awarded the second construction contract to Dutra and the contractor has started work. The second contract covers the Inner Harbor Turning Basin Phase I A-2. This contract covers some demolition, marine construction and a little dredging. The Corps has received approximately 8.4 million dollars for the project this year. The Corps is not scheduled to award any more contracts for this year.

b. S.F. Rock Removal Feasibility Study -

The Corps now has the draft Risk Model that gives the probability of an accident occurring. We are working on the Cost Benefit (BC) ratio that is scheduled to be presented to Corps Headquarters in mid October.

c. Avon Turning Basin – Status unchanged

The Corps expects to sign a Pre-construction Engineering Design (PED) cost sharing agreement with Contra Costa County on this project. However, we understand that Contra Costa County has given up on the oil companies and will work to form an assessment district to obtain the funds. Forming an assessment district may take some time. This will allow this project to start moving forward.

Congress added $250,000 this FY to prepare a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) and evaluate the feasibility of constructing a Turning Basin at Avon. This Basin is part of the un-constructed Phase III, John F. Baldwin Ship Channel project. To initiate this study the COE has prepared a Study Plan and has submitted a draft 75/25 cost sharing agreement to Contra Costa County, for their consideration.

4. EMERGENCY DREDGING

None

5. CORPS’ BUDGET

Most projects are underway and we are now waiting to see what funds will be in next years budget. We will know this then the budget is passed and signed.

6. OTHER WORK

The San Francisco District is looking at a feasibility study to deepen the JFB Ship Channel to Stockton. This would be only 1 or 2 feet. Reconnaissance Study was performed a couple of years ago. Division has given ok to proceed with study. The Corps signed the Pre-construction Engineering Design agreement with the Port of Stockton on July 11, 2002. This started the Phase 1 study on salinity and economics. This study is expected to take approximately 10 months. Department of Water Resources is performing the study and the Corps has already provided some of the funds.
The San Francisco District has taken over the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Deepening Project from the Sacramento District. This project is looking at deepening the channel from 30 feet to 35 feet. Corps has developed a Project Management Plan (PMP). We are scheduled to sign a concurrence on PMP some time this month. We will be doing a Limited Revaluation Report (LRR) that focuses on economics and updating the environmental documentation. We have initiated this project. The studies should take approximately 18 months.
Memorandum

Date:        September 12, 2002
To:          Harbor Safety Committee, San Francisco Bay Region
From:        Len Cardoza

Subject: Underwater Rocks Work Group Report

Summary: The Underwater Rocks Work Group’s meeting, scheduled August 20, 2002, was
cancelled due to lack of new information to discuss. Following is a report on progress on the
Corps of Engineers (CoE) Feasibility Study (FS) for the project.

Status of Contracts. The Corps of Engineers, via facsimile and e-mail, provided the following
progress reports on status of studies required for the FS.

- Risk Assessment Model. The consultant team completed the draft report in August and
  submitted it to the CoE. The report includes the probability of accident(s) on the rocks. When
  the probability factors are applied to damage estimates, from the oil spill model, the CoE will
  be able to determine project benefits (savings associated with damage prevention). The CoE is
  in the process of reviewing the draft report.


- Oil Spill Model. The Contract Option was exercised to include stochastic runs (based on
  random variables) and Economic Impact Analysis for a 2

  spill site at Blossom Rock. The Draft report was received in July 2002. The Final report is
  anticipated in September 2002. The executive summary for the voluminous report will be
  published on the CoE web site. A listing of the contributing reports follows:

  1. Preliminary Report, Oil Spill Type & Volume Analysis (all rocks), Feb 2002
  2. Draft Final Report, Bio-Economic Oil Spill Modeling - Shag and Blossom Rocks
     July 2002

- Geotechnical Analysis. As previously reported, the CoE was not able to come to an
  agreement with the consultant team on cost and scope of work. The CoE is proceeding
  with a literature search based on previous geotechnical investigations in the area. This
  approach will control costs and provide sufficient level of detail for the feasibility study.
  The information will be used to refine the scope of work for additional geotechnical
  analysis during the design phase of the project.

- Marine Geophysical Investigation. Complete. The report has been posted on CoE web
  site.

- Cultural Resource Survey. Complete. The report has been posted on the CoE web site.

- San Francisco District, Corps of Engineers web site. www.spn.usace.army.mil/ Click on
  publications/studies for reports referenced above.
F-3 Conference. As previously reported, CoE developed an “Information Paper” (summary of issues) in preparation for the Feasibility Study 3rd Milestone (F-3) conference, originally scheduled in June 2002. The Corps of Engineers determined that the “without project” conditions were incomplete, pending an estimate of the probability of a grounding on the rocks, and the estimated damages resulting from such an event. Once the probabilities are available from the risk assessment model (see discussion above), the CoE will apply construction cost estimates against them. This will generate the benefit to cost (B/C) ratios for the project alternatives. This information, in turn, will establish if the project is consistent with the National Economic Development policy that the Corps of Engineers must operate under in Civil Works projects. Therefore, the F-3 conference will be rescheduled to late September, pending the availability of the missing data. As previously reported, this is the first conference with the CoE leadership above District level, also referred to as the Feasibility Scoping Meeting. The conference will focus on the present project area conditions, and the economic analysis / risk assessment for the project, together with preliminary alternatives analysis.

Status of EIS/R. Detailed information is required on the proposed construction methods in order to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of each alternative. The Consultant team prepared a list of specific questions regarding these methods. The COE is preparing a report will include construction cost estimates for rock removal.

Project Alternatives. As previously reported, The Coe prepared a listing of preliminary alternatives, as part of the plan formulation process for the F-3 Conference. They include Structural Measures (Rock Lowering Alternatives and Channel/Lane Rerouting Alternatives) and Non-Structural Alternatives (Enhanced Tug Escort, Clean-up Response, and Aids to Navigation). The plan formulation process also includes a discussion of construction techniques and disposal of rock rubble; environmental comparisons; and the no action (without project) alternative necessary to complete the NEPA/CEQA process.

Construction Methods. St Louis District, Corps of Engineers, is providing expertise to help develop cost estimates for removing (lowering) the rocks, based on similar projects. These include, but are not limited to, explosive measures protected by “bubble curtains”. The study will also include other measures including rock dredges and chemical expansion. Anticipate preliminary cost estimates for all alternatives by the next meeting.

Project Schedule. Delays in developing a listing of alternatives, together with baseline environmental conditions (including fisheries resources) have impacted the FS schedule. The revised scheduled completion date for the study is of 1/8/04.

Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$1,879,500</td>
<td>$1,879,500</td>
<td>$3,759,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expended to date</td>
<td>$701,012</td>
<td>$1,178,802</td>
<td>$1,879,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Estimated Budget Expended to Date 50%

Meetings. The next Underwater Rocks Work Group meeting is tentatively scheduled September 24, 2002, 1000hr - 1200hr (CSLC Offices, Hercules, CA).
BAY AREA CAPTAIN'S ASSOCIATION
(B.A.C.A.)

B.A.C.A. MISSION STATEMENT:

IT IS THE GOAL OF THE BAY AREA CAPTAIN'S ASSOCIATION TO DEFINE AND PROMOTE THE LEGITIMATE INTERESTS OF ITS MEMBERS TO THE EXTENT THAT THOSE INTERESTS RELATE TO THE SAFE OPERATION AND NAVIGATION OF PASSENGER CARRYING VESSELS. THOSE INTERESTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE SAFETY OF PASSENGERS AND CREW; THE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT; THE MAINTENANCE AND CARE OF EXISTING VESSELS AND FACILITIES; THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VESSELS AND FACILITIES; THE FORMATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF RULES AND REGULATIONS BY BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTITIES AS THEY PERTAIN TO OUR MEMBERS AND THEIR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.
The Tug Escort Work Group continued discussion of whether the Harbor Safety Committee should alter its recommendation to require tug escorts for vessels carrying dangerous cargo in San Francisco Bay.

**Chemical Tanker Arrivals and Movements:**

To better understand the patterns of chemical tanker movements in the Bay, the Marine Exchange compiled lists of chemical tanker (as defined by Lloyds of London) arrivals and movements and LPG tanker arrivals and movements for the calendar year 2001.

In 2001, there were 87 chemical tanker arrivals; 56 different ships. Only two tankers arrived four or more times. The ships called at various Bay refineries and the Port of Stockton.

In 2001, there were 18 LPG arrivals; 9 different ships. The ships called at the Ports of Stockton and Sacramento.

Neither the Marine Exchange nor the Coast Guard compile a data base of the quantities and types of chemical carried. It was noted that one ship may have 51 separate interior tanks carrying a wide variety of product.

**Coast Guard Records:**

Lt. Dru Cranston, USCG reported there were no steering or propulsion failures or Captain of the Port orders in 2001 for the vessels listed by the Marine Exchange as chemical tankers. Lt. Cranston explained that the recent Sea Marshall program, begun post 9/11, now requires 96-hour advance reports of ship cargoes. The Coast Guard tracking data is difficult to access, so there is no readily available data base of chemicals carried in bay ships.

Under the Sea Marshall program, the Coast Guard now escorts LPG and anhydrous ammonia tankers from the Sea Buoy to berth. However, Coast Guard ‘escorts’ are small ships, not tugs.

**Discussion:**

In discussing this additional information, the Working Group noted that:

- Most chemical tankers are double-hulled ships subject to careful vetting reviews.
- “Cargoes of concern” are often carried in the middle of tankers.
• A number of ships carrying petroleum and chemical cargo are now being escorted by tugs. The Marine Exchange will compile this data for the year 2001 and report to our next meeting so we can determine how many chemical tankers are now being escorted by tugs.
• We recognize the potential adverse economic impact of requiring tug escorts in the Bay for all types of chemical tankers.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 11, 2001. 10:00, State Lands Commission, Hercules

Topics: MX 2001 statistics for tug escorts of petroleum/chemical tankers; Coast Guard analysis of Gaz Diamond (an anhydrous ammonia carrier) potential for accidents and possible Coast Guard recommendations; IMO definition of chemical tankers.