

**NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
AREA MARITIME SECURITY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

February 10, 2003 ~ 10:00 A.M.

Port Of Oakland Building, 530 Water Street ~ 2nd Floor ~ Boardroom

The meeting was called to order at 1004 hours with the salute and Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag.

Opening Remarks and Introductions (Captain Gerald M. Swanson, Federal Maritime Security Coordinator, Captain of Ports) This will be a closed meeting with security sensitive information. Anyone who was not in uniform or government services had to sign a disclosure statement. Committee Members introduced themselves around the table. Captain Swanson introduced a new proposed meeting schedule to meet quarterly beginning in April.

Maritime Security Plan (Draft) is nearing completion and members can come to Safety Marine Office and review plan.

California facility plan submittals are almost at 100% compliance. The USCG contractor, Black and Veach is reviewing them at this time in Kansas City. Final review and approval is expected within the next 30 days. For those who are not in compliance, they will be subject to violation notices and/or fines up to \$10,000.

There have been some procedural problems with the communication process involving the "96-hour Advance Notice of Arrival" from vessels. Follow-up warnings have been given to vessels arriving early or without notification.

At the last Committee meeting, four certificates of recognition for past work were awarded. We have more of those awards to give out and request your recommendations for other potential candidates.

Swearing In Additional New Members (Captain Gerald M. Swanson)

The following names and or organizations are requesting formal membership in the Committee.

Richard Barebanks, American Salvage
Blair Smith, MTC
Mark Christensen, APL
Harvey Bill, Private Citizen

Seafarer's
Private Boaters
National Cargo Bureau
California State Lands Commission

New Members

CAPT Charlie Bills, Hornblower Cruises
Mr. Laurence Thibeaux, ILWU
Mr. Randy Trudeau, Pacific Yacht Association (representing private boaters.)

Approval of Last Meeting's Minutes – (Captain Lynn Korwatch)

Minutes were approved as submitted.

Working Group Reports – (Capt Gerald M. Swanson)

Port Evacuation Work Group (Mr. Levin & CDR Cook – Chair)

The Afloat group was assigned this task initially and found that they needed more stakeholders. The group was expanded to include representation from oil ports, cruise industry, labor, PMA, Coast Guard, dry docks, etc. The group was able to produce a report and incorporate their recommendations. To orchestrate and carry out an evacuation, we have recommended that Coast Guard preside and control evacuations. Communication was the big issue, how to disseminate the information immediately. The need for a better communication system that can talk to everyone, including vessels, etc. Coast Guard calls people, those people call others and so on, a cascading and interlocking communication system. We made a strong recommendation that the evacuation plan be exercised several times to ring out communication problems. If this can be done during the upcoming exercise, it would be interesting to find the lessons learned.

The group wanted to share the report with everyone involved but it was deemed sensitive security and unable to be shared. This may prove to be a hindrance in the future to specific groups assigned tasks. Captain Swanson explained how policy on sensitive security information remains a work in progress and evolves daily. The Committee will forward cover letter/evacuation of plan to members. Kenny Levin requested the Coast Guard to distinguish if the evacuation plan document is sensitive material or can be shared. Lastly, Mr. Levin acknowledged the invaluable support from Cmdr. Cook and Taylor , USCG.

Security Zone Work Group (Mr. Ayers & CDR Phillips – Chair)

The group met a month ago and ran into a lot of unanswered questions that required additional representatives. We have contacted marine oil areas and requested their assistance in marking security zones. An enforcement issue was, whether a municipal or private agency can hold a person violating a security zone? Yes, a municipal agency can detain and Coast Guard then should respond and follow-up with fine or not. If a violation was committed, Coast Guard can seek prosecution.

The committee met with a number of organizations at the Neptune Coalition meeting and discussed security zones. Requested a number of agencies to participate in patrol and enforcements. Inquired if they understood how and where zones were, what violations are and they are willing to participate.

Commander Thompson has worked out the security zones boundaries to be presented at the next meeting. The group's focus was initially on marine terminals, but also identifies some other areas/issues and will present them in our recommendations. The group will meet today to finalize the draft and discuss outstanding issues.

Captain Swanson explained that we currently have permanent security zones extending around bridges, 200 yards around the watersides of all airports, as well as, 100 yards around moving vessels and near any high interest area (cruise ships, tankers, etc). Security zones are in place and will be enforced through USCG.

Reserve Fleets should be included in the security zones because they have active fleets. However, reserve fleets do not have the same fines or restrictions. Randy Rogers suggested making this a security zone during a MARSEC level change. .

Facility Personnel Security Work Group (Paul Martin, Ray Boyle - Chair)

The group met on Tuesday, Feb 3, with broad representation from labor, marine terminals and others. We reviewed issues raised at previous meetings regarding the expansion of the TSA TWIC pilot program to Oakland. Pending labor meetings on Feb 20th, our group will reconvene to discuss the labor unions decision on participation in the TWIC program on February 23rd. TSA representatives expressed willingness to attend union meeting to answer questions.

Communications Group Update (Jeff McCarthy)

All efforts for identifying funding for a communication system has not been successful. We are looking at a partnership between Federal, government agencies, etc., to discuss sharing costs. The group discussed how important it is to bring in other agencies and potential questions on how to assist people in an emergency. Community and government partnership in dealing with emergencies. The group is still working on a system to be in place by the end of 2004. Scenarios on possible issues around emergency planning are being scoped to integrate with communications issues. Next round of TSA grants will be announced in April 2004. Perhaps members can put on a line item in their grant requests that supports a communication system in this area.

Lynn Korwatch explained that there are a number of systems that communicate with other areas. There are no systems that speak to the entire industry. Marine Exchange in the role of a facilitator would like to fill this void for our industry people in the San Francisco Bay Region. Captain Swanson and the group do not have the assets. In the Port of San Francisco grants, we have applied for a communication system. These communication systems have been denied throughout. Captain Swanson mentioned getting together a grant group in order to work out these issues. Frank and Captain Swanson would recuse themselves from this working group due to a conflict of interest.

New Business Items (Capt Gerald M. Swanson)

Tabletop EX: Determined Promis 04 (DP-04) – (Mr. Fred Lau)

A preparatory exercise held on January 27th leading up to larger exercise scheduled this Fall based on aviation/maritime scenarios, including WMO scenarios. Communication amongst all of the agencies (Federal, State and Local/Regional) was the largest issue.

Captain Swanson mentioned the Department of Homeland Security (4 committee members), tasked to put together an interagency point of contact chart.

Draft Area Maritime Security Plan (AMSP) (Mr. Paul Martin)

Plan History, Feb 2004 new Draft AMSP is finished and ready for MSO senior staff committee review. July 2003 Interim regulations dictated that the Maritime Security Plan be revised accordingly.

Future Plans – Feb 2004 – Draft AMSP available for Committee member review at the Marine Safety Office – Committee Members must make an appointment with Mr. Martin (510) 437-3088 to review. There are four or five copies of the plan but they must be reviewed in the office.

March 2004 – Final review and approval by FMSC and submitted to Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District for review by April.

The AMS Plan is primarily an awareness, and prevention plan. While the plan does have some elements of a response plan it is not considered a response plan. Where overlaps occur, the plan states how it fits in with other plans.

AMS Plan Structure – *this portion of the minutes has been redacted to protect sensitive security information in accordance with 49CFR1520 (by Mr. Paul R. Martin).*

General Comments

Question: How specific are those 11 scenarios in your plan – The three scenarios with the highest risk scores are reasonably specific; the remaining 8 scenarios are generally stated. We still have not determined who will get the risk assessments when completed. We will make that determination later. Strict deadlines require a short time for plan review. All plans are subject to the approval of Commander, Pacific Area with a report made to the Commandant by June 1st, so that the USCG can make a report to the IMO.

Member cautions that certain portions do not go out in final plan, that AMSC members can only review the plan at MSO only. (Assessment Plan)

Is Humboldt Bay mentioned in any of the scenarios? The scenarios were constructed by cross-indexing various target types with threat types. Thus some scenarios do apply to the Humboldt Bay area.

What Information about the AMS Committee should be released to the Public? (Capt. L. Korwatch) Marine Exchange is tasked with maintaining your contact info, and is posing the question with you as a committee. What do you feel comfortable with giving out work contact info? Your name and position, employer, vs. name and what industry you represent. To be listed as committee members. As a federal mandate, we are exempt from sunshine laws, etc. At the organizational level, recommend name and industry representative. This group is an advisory committee but COTP has final say... COTP recommends that we stay a little bit anonymous. If members receive questions, you can refer to COTP to give answers. Committee recommended that all stakeholders, remain more general with public information. Work groups that outreach to larger groups, will have more exposure.

Committee motions that only the industry represented will show on public documents.

The Committee needs members or designees to come review plans and give comments. Designate 2 hours set aside for review period.

Harbor Safety Committee of the Year 2003 – Port Everglades. Only committee from Pacific Area nominated.

Three members still looking at – State of California, Homeland Security, Terminal Operator, City of San Francisco

Meeting was adjourned at 1142 hours.

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 13, 2004, 1000 hours at the Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, California.