



of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

## **HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SF BAY REGION**

Thursday, March 14, 2002

Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA

**Scott Merritt**, Foss Maritime Company, Vice Chair, called the public meeting to order at 10:05 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; **Nancy Pagan**, Port of Benicia; **Margot Brown**, National Boating Federation; **Don Watters**, CSX Lines; **Gunnar Lundeborg**, (alternate for Marina Secchitano), Sailors Union of the Pacific; **Margaret Reasoner**, Crowley Maritime Services; **Kathryn Zagzebski**, The Marine Mammal Center; **Michael Beatie**, Golden Gate Bridge District, Ferry Division; **Capt. Larry Teague**, San Francisco Bar Pilots; and **Joan Lundstrom**, Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Also present were U. S. Coast Guard representatives, **Capt. Larry Hereth** (MSO); **Cdr. David Kranking**, (VTS); U. S. Army Corps of Engineers representative, **David Dwinell**; OSPR representatives, **Harlan Henderson** and **Al Storm**; California State Lands representative, **Bob Davila**; and Marine Exchange/Clearinghouse representative, **Lynn Korwatch**. In addition, more than thirty representatives of the maritime community and interested public were present.

The following corrections were made to the minutes of the 2-14-02 meeting. **L. Cardoza**: Page 4, the amount in the funding in the President's budget for the Everglades project is \$130 million and the amount for NY/NJ is \$120 million. Also on page 4, sentence should read: "And, what is of most concern is the intention to accelerate these projects, which will decrease the amount of funding available for other projects." MOTION by **J. Lundstrom**, seconded by **J. Davey**, to "approve the minutes of the 2-14-02 meeting as corrected." Motion passed unanimously.

**S. Merritt** welcomed OSPR Administrator **Harlan Henderson** to the meeting.

**USCG COTP'S REPORT, L. Hereth**. (1) **Lcdr. John Caplis**: A written report of port operations statistics for pollution response and investigations and significant port safety events for the period February 1, 2002 through February 28, 2002 is made a part of these minutes. (2) Positive identification of the JACOB LUCHENBACH as the source of the San Mateo mystery spill has been confirmed through lab identification of a sample brought up by divers and compared with the oil on birds. A Request for Proposal for salvage contractors has gone out. **L. Hereth**: 1600 birds were oiled in the latest instance and 2000 in 1998. OSPR's California Labs has verified that the leakage from the LUCHENBACH extends back to 1993. Getting the oil out will be difficult because the vessel is substantially damaged, is in the midst of a marine sanctuary and has been declared to be an historical structure. These factors will mean that a lot of permitting and discussion will be required. The vessel is outside state waters and money for the salvage operation will come from the Oil Spill Management Trust Fund. (3) The next Carquinez

# Harbor Safety Committee

of the San Francisco Bay Region

Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990

Bridge construction project is in the formative phase. Fourteen wire strands will be installed across the channel from mid-June to mid-July. This will have a significant impact on navigational waterways and will require that the channel be closed for fourteen six-hour intervals during that period. **L. Hereth:** The Carquinez Bridge Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is coming out soon describing the planned closures that will probably be from 0030 to 0630 every day, with picket boats and a CG boat placed to keep traffic out. Anyone impacted by the closures is invited to submit comments. (4) Question: When vessels are boarded outside for cause, is the CG checking for STCW compliance? **J. Caplis:** That is not the focus of the boarding. **L. Hereth:** As the boarding team is screening the crew, chances are they would check licenses and pick up the fact that a crewmember is not compliant. But no warnings will be given until August 1<sup>st</sup>, since IMO pushed compliance enforcement out six months, from February to August. (5) **L. Hereth:** There have been ten cases of Rule 9 violations since last fall and the CG is aggressively moving ahead in investigating these cases. Maximum effort should be directed towards prevention of these incidents. **M. Brown:** Would encourage the CG to prosecute these cases to the greatest extent possible and publicize the cases. This would prove invaluable in educating the recreational boating public and small fishing boat operators. **L. Hereth:** Besides doing that, the CG is trying to educate the public through a number of forums, including addressing the PICYA (97 Northern California yacht clubs represented) and an article in *Latitude 38*. **M. Brown:** The people who attend PICYA conferences are the more aware and concerned boaters. The people who read *Latitude 38* are mostly sailors and not powerboat operators. The non-affiliated boaters, fishermen and hunters can best be reached through local newspapers. **M. Brown** will meet with **L. Hereth** to provide information on who should be approached. Recommendation from the floor that a press release stating that Rule 9 violations will be prosecuted to the fullest extent should be included in connection with Opening Day press. (6) **L. Hereth:** The new Transportation Security Administration grant program has been established, with \$93 million allocated to be spent this year. The program is open to port authorities, private ports and terminals. The program is based on minimizing risk. Information can be found on the program website: <https://www.portsecuritygrants.dotts.net/>. Applications are due by March 27, 2002 and must be electronically filed. In the SF Bay Area, applications will initially be reviewed by CG MSO and MARAD to determine the criteria for prioritizing applications. The ultimate review will be conducted by the Transportation Security Administration. Four categories have been identified: strategic ports, controlled ports, and locations with high passenger count and locations with high economic impact to the local area or nation.

**CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT, A. Steinbrugge.** A written report with statistics for the month of February 2002 is made a part of these minutes. There were no calls to OSPR so far this year. There were six in 2001 and five in 2000.

# Harbor Safety Committee

of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

**OSPR REPORT, A. Storm.** (1) AB 715, which passed last fall, included a provision giving OSPR authority over oil spill response organizations. Draft regulations are on the OSPR website. Two public hearings are scheduled, with the one for Northern California to be held on 4-30-02 at 10:00 at the Bay Model. The Southern California hearing will be held on 5-2-02 and public comments are due by the end of business that day. (2) Regarding the LUCHENBACH, efforts to save birds have been completed, but in the event of high winds or birds coming in sometime in the future, teams will again be activated. During salvage efforts, protocol will be activated. **H. Henderson** noted that he was COTP in 1998 when the investigation of the previous incident occurred and stated that kudos go to all involved, including OSPR, State Lands, the CG, Fish and Game and the labs. (2) **H. Henderson** reported on two meetings he recently attended. The Port Symposium in Rhode Island had an East Coast flavor. The focus was on the 'new normalcy' since September 11<sup>th</sup>. California is the model for efforts on this front. In discussions and break-out groups at the National Harbor Safety Committee Conference, it was apparent that California is again out front. **S. Merritt** noted that the HSC is tasked as an advisory body to the Administrator and the HSC appreciates the Administrator's attendance at this meeting. The teamwork of regulatory bodies in addressing the LUCHENBACH spill was incredible from an industry standpoint. All agencies involved worked in cooperation with no credit-taking.

**NOAA Report.** None.

**COE REPORT, D. Dwinell.** The text of the COE Report is made a part of these minutes. Question: What is the status of COE dredging for Pinole Channel? **D. Dwinell:** None is scheduled for this year. It's on a two-year schedule, except for emergency dredging if there is shoaling. **L. Teague:** That area is critical to all up river port. Question: If the proposed turning basin at Avon is completed, will that up the priority of Pinole Shoal Channel? **D. Dwinell** responded that he didn't know. **Roberta Goulart,** Contra Costa County Community Development Department: There are two ways to get Pinole Shoal Channel designated priority one. The issue is primarily political. Representative George Miller carries projects not in the COE budget as add-ons. He will take on having Pinole Shoal Channel classified as priority one if the Avon Turning Basin Project moves forward. It takes continual dredging for five consecutive years to become priority one. Pinole Shoal has been dredged for the past three, so it probably will happen. Until Mare Island closed, the Navy handled Pinole Shoal dredging. Contra Costa County is asking for \$4 million for Pinole Shoal Channel dredging in WRDA 2003 monies. Are the ESSAYONS looking at the channel this time? **D. Dwinell:** No. **Capt. Eric Dohm,** San Francisco Bar Pilots: The pilots have recommended soundings every six months, but it's only happening once a year. As a result no one knows if there are problems or shoaling. The size of the area being surveyed in Bulls Head Channel is not large enough. **R. Goulart** provided a background of the Avon Turning Basin issue. The San Francisco Bar Pilots have been



of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

concerned about the lack of a turning basin since 1991. Contra Costa County and the COE put the proposed turning basin project in the John. F. Baldwin Project, which died in 1999. Completion of the turning basin is contingent on local sponsorship and cost-sharing with the federal government. It is the policy of the Contra County Board of Supervisors to facilitate getting funding from local sponsors in industry if the benefits of a project are identified as beneficial. The difficulty in getting funding from the industry in this case is because of changes in ownership and the personnel of Avon Refinery. Federal Trade Commission requirements prohibit Valero from committing because they are selling to Tesoro, who is also prohibited from committing because they are not yet owners. **L. Hereth** and **Capt. Peter McIsaac** of the San Francisco Bar Pilots helped put together a meeting of high-level corporate representatives of the oil companies and Contra Costa County representatives on 3-4-02. The county has verbal commitments from Valero/Ultramar and Tesoro. **R. Goulart** will have letters to take to Washington, DC next week to look for the federal funding portion. It is expected that contracts will be signed in the next few weeks. Contra Costa County has always supported maintenance dredging to 35' of water, to keep enough water for the oil industry to do business. The needed funding for this dredging is not coming through the civil works budget. Everyone interested should write to the Congressional Delegation. The county is looking for \$6.5 million for Suisun Bay Channel upland disposal, \$2 million for Avon and \$300,000 for a salinity study to look at deepening that area 1'- 4'. **L. Hereth** noted that **R. Goulart** has continued to bring a great deal of energy to these efforts.

**STATE LANDS MARITIME FACILITY SECURITY UPDATE, B. Davila.** The final version of the emergency regulations for facilities can be found on the State Lands' website: [www.slc.ca.gov](http://www.slc.ca.gov). They will be in effect for 120 days, beginning 3-7-02, while work continues in Long Beach to develop permanent regulations.

**NAVIGATION WORKGROUP REPORT, L. Teague.** With everything that has transpired over the past week in connection with the proposed Avon Turning Basin project, it is apparent that things are being handled well. The work group feels that the letter discussed previously is not necessary.

**UNDERWATER ROCKS WORKGROUP REPORT, L. Cardoza.** (1) The work group met on 2-19-02 and a copy of the group's report is made a copy of these minutes. (2) **L. Cardoza** congratulated the COE on the completion of Contract 1 for the Port of Oakland's -50' Project, as reported at the last meeting, and noted that they are moving on to Contract 2. The port continues to work to replace funding in the COE Operations and Maintenance budget and **L. Cardoza** will go with **R. Goulart** to Washington, DC next week.



of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

**FERRY OPERATIONS WORKGROUP REPORT, N. Pagan.** (1) **M. Beatie** read the letter the group recommends be sent to the California Congressional Delegation regarding funding for debris removal. "On behalf of the Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region, I write to request your support for additional appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers' Debris Removal Projects. It has been brought to our attention that some funding has been allocated to design of a new debris removal vessel that will work in conjunction with the existing vessel the M/V Raccoon. We fully support this new vessel. This winter, while the M/V Raccoon was laid up in dry dock with a rudder problem, there was virtually no debris removal and several of the fast ferries ingested debris in their water jet intakes causing delays and sometimes expensive diving operations. The debris removal projects are especially important to the new fast ferries plying San Francisco Bay, providing an important and popular transportation alternative. We also understand that the A.C.O.E. is severely understaffed at the Sausalito location because of recent budget cuts. We urge you to seek funding to alter this serious lack of manpower. Additionally, we understand that there is talk of abolishing the GS-12 position of Chief of Navigation. This would be a huge loss as this is the person who coordinates the entire debris removal project. We are very concerned about cuts in Operation and Maintenance funding in the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works budget for port and harbor work. Local government and industry are working as cost-sharing partners with the federal government to fulfill our common interests in successful trade and commerce and commensurate environmental restoration. We believe cost-sharing is a fair and reasonable approach and deserves continued federal support. Thank you for your consideration of these requests." **M. Brown:** If the HSC sends this letter, there is a question as to appropriateness of the reference to retaining the GS-12 position. That isn't the business of the HSC and it would be better if individuals send this letter. In addition, the letter shouldn't be limited just to the effect of debris removal on ferries, but rather on all vessels on the bay. **J. Lundstrom:** Agrees that, because the charge of the HSC is the navigation of all vessels to prevent accidents, language should be expanded to include all vessels. Language should be changed to express concern over cut-backs on staffing, but not to tell the agency what to do regarding specific personnel. **D. Dwinell** reported that he has met with **Lt. Col. Timothy O'Rourke**, who appreciates the support of the HSC. The open slots in Sausalito are the result of promotions and will be filled. Manning issues will be resolved within the COE and the Lt. Col. recommends deleting the language related to staffing. He recommends beefing up language related to vessel and environmental safety issues. The Chair agreed that the letter needs to be re-worked and broader based. **M. Beatie** responded that the letter came from the Ferry Operations Work Group, but can be expanded. **D. Dwinell:** The new boat is in the works for 2004. The COE can't lobby for it, but others can. **MOTION** by **M. Brown**, seconded by **J. Lundstrom**, to "send the letter back to the work group for re-working and reagendaize for a vote at the next HSC meeting." Motion passed unanimously. (2) **N. Pagan** read the following report regarding no wake signage. "The work group met on 3-6-02 at the State Lands Office. The group decided that the posting of precautionary signs around



of the San Francisco Bay Region

Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990

wake sensitive areas of the San Francisco waterfront would not be an effective means of reaching the primary wake generators. It was agreed to put the sign on the back burner but recommended that the language on the sign read 'Caution Minimum Wake Area'. The wake issue can be best addressed through communication and management that has been demonstrated by a number of ferry operators with their use of wake specific standing orders and ongoing communications with concerned parties. The Red & White Fleet has made contact with a number of the primary wake generators and through the existing groups, including the Bay Area Ferry Operators, HSC Ferry Workgroup, Prevention through People Workgroup and the U. S. Coast Guard, we feel this can be accomplished. Also, the Red & White Fleet indicated that they would request that the U. S. Coast Guard send out an advisory letter on managing wakes in wake sensitive areas to commercial operators. Also, those affected by wakes would continue to identify the source of the wakes affecting them and attempt to contact the operator/owners directly. We felt that, with the ongoing communication to operators about wake sensitive areas and an active policy of managing wakes through voluntary enforcement of standing orders on vessels, wake hazards can be sufficiently mitigated."

**HUMAN FACTORS WORK GROUP, D. Watters.** The group last met a month and a half ago to complete work on the engine and propulsion casualty brochure. **Rob Hughes**, OSPR, was unavailable to attend this meeting, so the group would like to move approval of the brochure to the agenda for the April HSC meeting.

**PREVENTION THROUGH PEOPLE WORKGROUP, M. Brown.** (1) The map has been completed and approved. Before it can go to print, a bid from the state printing office is required. If the state printing office does the job, the earliest the project will be completed is the end of April. If an outside printer does the job, it should be done the end of March. (2) A CalTrans representative attended the last workgroup meeting to engage the group as to suggestions for broadcasting proposed closures of Carquinez Strait. Suggested resources include the CG Auxiliary and Power Squadrons' boats as moving billboards. **M. Brown** will forward contact names to CalTrans. (3) 30,000 copies of the *Recreational Vessel Maritime Radio Communications* brochure have been printed. LA/LB has printed a pocket guide to VHF channels. 600,000 copies of *Only You Can Take the Search Out of Search and Rescue* regarding the use of cell phones have been printed. They are being distributed to CG Auxiliary and Power Squadron members. Copies are available from **M. Brown**. (2) STCW 95 Enforcement Letter. **M. Brown** read the letter recommended by the workgroup. "The Harbor Safety Committee (HSC) is pleased with the standards established in the STCW 95 compliance requirements and feels that they represent a tremendous benefit to the safety and efficiency of operations in our harbor. We agree that all seamen should be held to an equal standard in regard to safety of vessels on all waters of the world. We are disappointed in the decision of the IMO to extend the deadline for compliance of STCW 95 to July 31, 2002. In view of existing United States

# Harbor Safety Committee

of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

Homeland Security initiatives, it is essential that all mariners entering United States waters be properly qualified. It is regrettable that some flag states have not met the standards in the seven years allowed; United States mariners have met these requirements. The Harbor Safety Committee of San Francisco strongly recommends that no further extension is granted.”

MOTION by **M. Brown**, seconded by **M. Beatie**, to “approve sending the letter as written.” **G. Lundeberg** suggested the letter be sent to the Governor, OSPR, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of Transportation Minetta, and the California Congressional Delegation.

**M. Brown**: There was no consensus in the workgroup regarding to whom the letter should be written, with copies to others. The HSC should determine the primary recipient. The noted that IMO made the recommendation to delay enforcement and the CG made the decision to honor the request. The Chair recommended the letter be directed to the Secretary of Transportation and Commandant of the CG with copies to the California Congressional Delegation. **L. Korwatch** added that the full name of the committee should be used, Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region. Question called. Motion passed unanimously.

**TUG ESCORT WORKGROUP REPORT, J. Lundstrom**. The workgroup met on 3-12-02 to focus on preparing recommendations for conducting escort training on SF Bay to practice emergency procedures for tugs/tankers/pilots. The group decided that this should not be in regulation and a sub-committee was formed with industry members. The bay has eight tug companies with thirty-three different tugs and non-dedicated tanker traffic. The workgroup is looking for agreement between pilots, tug companies, and tanker companies for training for certain defined movements and the sharing of lessons learned, along with standardized tug command language. The next workgroup meeting is scheduled for 4-30-02 at 2:00 at State Lands. The full group will review the draft recommendations developed by the sub-committee and submit their comments and suggestions. The draft is also going to tanker companies, tug companies, and pilots for comment. The sub-committee will bring back revised recommendations for the full workgroup at its next meeting and then the workgroup will bring them to the HSC for incorporation into the Harbor Safety Plan. The draft recommendations are available by e-mail from **Greg Brooks** of SeaRiver Maritime.

**PORTS REPORT, A. Steinbrugge**. **A. Steinbrugge** did reconnaissance with CalTrans on the Benicia Bridge looking for a new location for the current meter. The CH continues to work on funding from the state.

**OLD BUSINESS**. None.

**NEW BUSINESS**. (1) **M. Beatie** suggested the HSC send a letter to **Ray Tsuneyoshi**, Director of California Department of Boating and Waterways, seeking his support for efforts to restore the COE budget. The Chair suggested developing a stock letter seeking funding support for the



# Harbor Safety Committee

of the San Francisco Bay Region

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

COE and outlining HSC concerns regarding dredging issue. **M. Beatie:** The letter presented during the Ferry Workgroup Report was drafted by the Bay Planning Coalition. The Chair suggested the letter be directed to the Navigation Committee for review and brought back to the HSC at the next meeting. **M. Beatie:** The letter was already discussed in the Ferry Operations Workgroup. The Chair asked that the letter be modified to represent the mission and concerns of the HSC. **L. Cardoza:** A vote on the letter appears on the agenda for this meeting. The Chair responded that the letter should be distributed so committee members can review it, with a possible vote on the agenda for the next HSC meeting, under a heading designating 'dredging funding support'. (2) **L. Korwatch:** The Harbor Safety Plan Review is due the end of July. All sections of the plan are available in electronic form on the MX website. Previously, sections have gone to groups/people responsible for the specific reference. It is proposed that the entire plan be reviewed by a temporary workgroup. Most of the work can be done by e-mail. **S. Merritt, T. Wilson** and **M. Beatie** volunteered to serve on the workgroup. Comments should be sent to **S. Merritt** by e-mail to: [scottm@foss.com](mailto:scottm@foss.com). (3) **L. Korwatch:** Security is being embraced as part of the harbor safety committee mandate across the country. The success of the local NY response to the September 11<sup>th</sup> attack was in great part due to the connections and relationships made through the harbor safety committee and was part of a NY presentation at the National Harbor Safety Committee Conference. The next conference is scheduled for March 2003, in New York City. (4) **L. Korwatch:** There is an effort to resurrect the Propeller Club. A meeting is scheduled at Scott's Restaurant in Jack London Square on March 27, 2002. (5) **L. Korwatch:** The Annual Marine Exchange May Day Party will be held on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, beginning at 5:00, at Pier 35. (6) **D. Kranking:** At the National Harbor Safety Committee Conference, NY equivalent of the SF HSC received the first award for Harbor Safety Committee of the Year. The Office of Emergency Management was destroyed with the towers. The local community services made use of relationships, lessons and back-up plans developed through the HSC. VTS deployed six personnel to a pilot boat and the harbor was closed to recreational boating for two weeks. In the immediate aftermath, they found that, when they were evacuating people to the ferry landing, people paid more attention to people in uniforms, so they put people in CG uniforms. Among other issues addressed at the conference, was a segment on navigational safety technology. The U.S. is putting forward a resolution to IMO that AIS be implemented in 2004, rather than 2008. While the focus was on security, there was some discussion of MTS. It is recognized that some harbor safety committees are not chartered to look at MTS issues. If these issues are not addressed on a local level, comments and concerns should be forwarded to the national level. Harbor Safety Committees' best practices were discussed, including San Diego's program to publicize Rule 9 requirements using posters, decals for rental boats and placemats in waterfront restaurants; web-based vessel arrival information and local representatives being designated to report to COTP Port Safety Committees. (7) **L. Hereth:** The next Oil Spill Conference is scheduled for Vancouver in March/April, 2003. Information, deadline for abstracts, is available at the website: [www.iosc.org](http://www.iosc.org). (8) **Inspector Richard Avery**, U. S.



# Harbor Safety Committee

**of the San Francisco Bay Region**

*Mandated by the California Oil Spill  
Prevention and Response Act of 1990*

Customs Hazardous Materials Coordinator and Safety Officer for East Bay Trade: The recently appointed U. S. Customs Anti-Terrorist Assistant Commissioner will be visiting terminals looking for ways to improve security in the transport of containers on the bay and over land.

The next meeting of the HSC will be held at 1000 hours at the Port of Richmond on 4-11-02.

Meeting adjourned without objection at 1210.

Respectfully submitted,



Captain Lynn Korwatch  
Executive Secretary

**USCG Marine Safety Office San Francisco Bay  
Port Operations Statistics  
For 1 to 28 February 2002**

<b>PORT SAFETY:</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
• SOLAS Interventions/COTP Orders:	2
• Propulsion Casualties	1
• Steering Casualties:	0
• Collisions/Allisions:	0
• Groundings	0
<b>POLLUTION RESPONSE:</b>	<b>MSO</b>
<b>Total oil pollution incidents within San Francisco Bay for the month:</b>	<b>10</b>
▪ Source Identification; Discharges and Potential Discharges from:	
Deep Draft Vessels	1
Facilities (includes all non-vessel)	2
Military/Public Vessels	2
Commercial Fishing Vessels	0
Other Commercial Vessels	0
Non-Commercial Vessels (e.g. pleasure craft)	2
Unknown Source (as of the end of the month)	3
▪ Spill Volume:	
Unconfirmed	4
No Spill, Potential Needing Action	1
Spills < 10 gallons	3
Spills 10 to 100 gallons	2
Spills 100 to 1000 gallons	0
Spills > 1000 gallons	0

## **Significant Cases:**

FEB - Ongoing oiled bird response and investigation into the source of the San Mateo Mystery Spill. On 07 FEB, oil sample analysis matched oil collected in the surface waters above the SS LACOB LUCKENBACH, a C-3 freighter sunk 17 miles SSW of the Golden Gate in 1953, with oil collected from the birds. Samples were also matched cases dating back to 1992-1993.

5-6 FEB –VORTEX Diving utilized a remote operating vehicle (ROV) and sonar for SS JACOB LUCKENBACH investigation.

12-14 FEB –FUGRO West, Inc. to conducted a side-scan sonar and multi-beam bathymetry survey of the SS JACOB LUCKENBACH, the surrounding debris field, and anchor clearance area of 6000 feet by 6000 feet. FUGRO West collected all of the data and provided useful maps and a video of the wreck site to be used for operational planning.

18-28 FEB – USCG and Navy Supervisor of Salvage developed a Request for Proposal (RFP) to complete the Assessment and Removal Operations on the SS JACOB LUCKENBACH. Consultation between the FOSC, potential bidders, and resource trustees in ongoing. Technical review of proposals is scheduled to begin on 25 Mar.

02 FEB – M/V LT PATRIOT (PN) lost propulsion momentarily while transiting in the Oakland Outer Harbor Channel. A COTP Order was issued requiring the vessel to have a classification society attend the vessel to determine the cause of the propulsion loss and witness any repairs. Repairs were made and COTP Order was rescinded.

17 FEB – M/V WEHR MUEDEN (GE) did not send a crew list and dangerous cargo manifest as required. Agent was concerned because he had not heard from vessel in 3 days, and last communication included requests from the master for extreme discretion in the handling of the crew change. A COTP Order was issued for the vessel not to enter San Francisco Bay until a successful at sea Coast Guard boarding is completed. A port security boarding team and Sea Marshals boarded vessel and found no discrepancies, and the COTP order was rescinded.

07,14, 26 FEB – USCG has been meeting with representatives of the U.S. Army's Military Ocean Terminal Concord (MOTCO) concerning the Army's Military Explosive Offloads scheduled for March and April.

# San Francisco Bay Clearinghouse Report For February 2002

## San Francisco Bay Region Totals

			<b>2001</b>
Tanker arrivals to San Francisco Bay	58		59
Tank ship movements & escorted barge movements	239		292
Tank ship movements	146	61.09%	191
Escorted tank ship movements	97	40.59%	100
Unescorted tank ship movements	49	20.50%	91
Tank barge movements	93	38.91%	101
Escorted tank barge movements	52	21.76%	50
Unescorted tank barge movements	41	17.15%	51
Percentages above are percent of total tank ship movements & escorted barge movements for each item.			
Escorts reported to OSPR	0		0

<b>Movements by Zone</b>	<b>Zone 1</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Zone 2</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Zone 4</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Zone 6</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Total movements	145		204		0		136		485	
Unescorted movements	52	35.86%	76	37.25%	0	0.00%	50	36.76%	178	36.70%
Tank ships	34	23.45%	48	23.53%	0	0.00%	20	14.71%	102	21.03%
Tank barges	18	12.41%	28	13.73%	0	0.00%	30	22.06%	76	15.67%
Escorted movements	93	64.14%	128	62.75%	0	0.00%	86	63.24%	307	63.30%
Tank ships	66	45.52%	94	46.08%	0	0.00%	48	35.29%	208	42.89%
Tank barges	27	18.62%	34	16.67%	0	0.00%	38	27.94%	99	20.41%

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 2001

## San Francisco Bay Region Totals

			<u>2000</u>
Tanker arrivals to San Francisco Bay	108		649
Tank ship movements & escorted barge movements	480		3,212
Tank ship movements	304	63.33%	2,101
Escorted tank ship movements	171	35.63%	1,100
Unescorted tank ship movements	133	27.71%	1,001
Tank barge movements	176	36.67%	1,111
Escorted tank barge movements	102	21.25%	550
Unescorted tank barge movements	74	15.42%	561
Percentages above are percent of total tank ship movements & escorted barge movements for each item.			
Escorts reported to OSPR	0		0

<u>Movements by Zone</u>	<u>Zone 1</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Zone 2</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Zone 4</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Zone 6</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
Total movements	290		433		0		262		985	
Unescorted movements	122	42.07%	189	43.65%	0	#DIV/0!	111	42.37%	422	42.84%
Tank ships	82	28.28%	131	30.25%	0	#DIV/0!	60	22.90%	273	27.72%
Tank barges	40	13.79%	58	13.39%	0	#DIV/0!	51	19.47%	149	15.13%
Escorted movements	168	57.93%	244	56.35%	0	0.00%	151	57.63%	563	57.16%
Tank ships	107	36.90%	163	37.64%	0	0.00%	84	32.06%	354	35.94%
Tank barges	61	21.03%	81	18.71%	0	0.00%	67	25.57%	209	21.22%

### 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**

**14 March 2002**

**1. CORPS 2002 O&M DREDGING PROGRAM**

- a. ***Main Ship Channel*** – March – April 2002 timeframe – Corps dredge Essayons scheduled to start dredging approximately March 22 to 27. Start date will depend on Essayons completing urgent work on Humboldt Harbor. Main Ship Channel and Richmond will take a total of 25 days.
- b. ***Richmond Outer and Southampton*** - March – April 2002 timeframe – Corps dredge Essayons scheduled to starting dredging approximately March 22 to 27. Start date will depend on Essayons completing urgent work on Humboldt Harbor. Main Ship Channel and Richmond will take a total of 25 days.
- c. ***Richmond Inner*** – May – June 2002 time frame – Ocean Disposal.
- d. ***Oakland (Inner & Outer)*** – June – July 2002 timeframe – Ocean Disposal.
- e. ***Suisun Bay Channel*** - July- August 2002 timeframe – Upland Disposal if funding permits.
- f. **San Rafael** – This is a congressional addition to the Corps budget – In-Bay/Winter Island Disposal.
- g. **Petaluma** – This is a congressional addition to the Corps budget – Upland Disposal.
- h. **Larkspur** - August - September2002 timeframe – In-Bay Disposal at Alcatraz. Anticipate a late start because of environmental window in one location of the channel. Still on schedule.

Note: Corps has received our Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and our Consistency Determination from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. These are both good for a two-year period.

## **2. DEBRIS REMOVAL**

The total tonnage of debris collected on the San Francisco Bay for February 2002 was approximately 70 tons. This is down from the 263 tons for January. The Raccoon only operated four days because of rudder damage, but collected 45 tons during the three-day period. The Raccoon came out of the shipyard on 21 February and is now back in service. One reason for the decrease in the amount collected is the Grizzly can be restricted by high winds and fog. However, the winds also tend to push the debris out of the shipping lane and onto the shore. With high tides, the debris will eventually come back into the bay.

## **3. UNDERWAY OR UPCOMING HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS**

a. **Oakland 50-ft** – Construction is underway. Corps has awarded the second construction contract to Dutra. The second contract will cover 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. With the available funds, Corps may only be able to let one more contract this year.

### **b. S.F. Rock Removal Feasibility Study -**

The 50% Administrative Draft of the EIS/R has been completed, reviewed and revisions accomplished. Copies were provided to the other Agencies around 1 February. Alternatives formulation will be a major portion of work for the 100% Administrative Draft.

A contract for a Risk Model has been awarded. We have also received the draft oil spill model. This model provides the first estimate of damage caused by an oil spill. This will be used to balance against the cost of removing the rocks.

### **c. Avon Turning Basin.**

Coast guard has met with the users and it looks like the cost sharing agreement should go forward. Work on the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) could start as early as next month.

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 50/50 cost sharing agreement to Contra Costa County, for their consideration.



#### **4. EMERGENCY DREDGING**

We continue to monitor the problem area in the Suisun Channel that has required emergency dredging in the past. Last survey showed this area to be satisfactory. Next survey is scheduled for early April.

The Corps has received calls from the Port of Redwood City about shoaling after the recent winter storms. The Corps is in the process of obtaining and evaluating the impact of any shoaling on this project.

#### **5. CORPS' BUDGET**

Status unchanged.

Corps has received the funds for projects scheduled this year. After review of the funding for this year, there is some concern we could be short of funds. However, this will depend on the actual shoaling rates on our projects. However, the Corps still intends to complete all projects scheduled for this year. The Corps budget contains congressional additions for San Rafael and Petaluma maintenance dredging.

#### **6. OTHER WORK**

The San Francisco District and the Sacramento District are looking at a joint feasibility study to deepen the JFB Ship Channel from Avon 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 Port of Stockton and Contra Costa County have agreed in principle to cost share the study.

Corps is looking to have additional work accomplished on the salinity model by someone that is independent of the Corps.

## Memorandum

Date: March 6, 2002

To: Harbor Safety Committee, San Francisco Bay Region

From: Len Cardoza

Subject: Underwater Rocks Work Group Report

Summary: The Underwater Rocks Work Group held a meeting on February 19, 2002 at the California State Lands Commission offices, Hercules, CA. The central theme for the meeting was the status of the Corps of Engineers (CoE) Feasibility Study (FS) for the project. Attendees for the Rocks Work Group included representatives from the Corps of Engineers (CoE), FS consultant team members, California State Lands Commission (CSLC), Port of Oakland, San Francisco Bar Pilots, and Marine Exchange.

Status of Contracts. Attendees discussed the status of contracts required for the FS.

- Risk Model. Funding is in place. The CoE successfully negotiated the contract for the Risk Model with the firm EQE. Anticipate three month duration.
- Benthic Survey. Complete. Final Report is posted on the CoE web site.
- Oil Spill Model. Draft report received February 14, 2002. The report is being revised to correct errors in the draft report. Estimates of potential damages are presented in draft Oil Spill Model report. There is no resolution, however, between gross estimates and those which are attributable toward the determination of the National Economic Development (NED) plan. The cost of mitigation is not discussed in the Oil Spill Model. This can be significant greatly affect the total project cost. Estimates for required mitigation will be prepared, based on the recommended plan. The executive summary for the voluminous report will be published on the CoE web site.
- 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/](http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/) Click on publications/studies for reports referenced above.

F-3 Conference. The CoE continues to prepare the project documentation for the Feasibility Study 3rd Milestone (F-3) conference, scheduled march 2002. 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. The 50% Administrative Draft EIS/R, submitted on 5 December 2001, was reviewed by COE and SLC. The two agencies met with the consultant on 18 December 2001 to

review the document. Revisions were incorporated into the document. NMFS and FWS received relevant sections for review. BCDC and RWQCB will also receive copies. The Project Schedule reflects the completion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Admin draft EIS/R before the final selection of alternatives is made. The CoE will adjust the schedule to allow for impact evaluation of the alternatives chosen to go forward.

Project Alternatives. The meeting attendees reviewed operational alternatives and discussed which may be viable as a non-structural alternative (required for the Feasibility Study report and under NEPA/CEQA). The CSL and COE will continue work to refine these alternatives. As previously reported, the potential project alternatives may reflect three general categories, in addition to the no project alternative:

- Rock reduction. Reduce (lower) all or some combination of the identified submerged hazards to navigation (Harding, Shag, Arch, Blossom Rocks and the unnamed shoal west of Alcatraz Island). The rock reduction alternative will also include discussion and analysis of alternative methods for removal and disposal.
- Re-align / construct new channels. Dredge to widen and deepen existing San Francisco Bay Traffic lanes
- Operational Restrictions. Incorporate the work by the Harbor Safety Committee to continue to refine tug escort regulations and/or other operational restrictions (vessel speed, piloting, two way traffic, etc.).

Budget/Schedule. Delays in developing a listing of alternatives, together with baseline environmental conditions (including fisheries resources) may impact the FS schedule beyond the completion date of 5/27/03. The CoE will analyze schedule implications.

Meetings. The next Underwater Rocks Work Group meeting is scheduled **March 21, 2002, 1000hr - 1200hr** (CSLC Offices, Hercules, CA). Dagmar Schmidt (Environmental Research Consulting) will attend this meeting and discuss her economic damage estimates.

<Date>

The Honorable <Our Congressional Representative>  
Attention <Legislative Director>  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Subject: San Francisco Bay Debris Removal

Dear Representative <Name>

On behalf of <Your Company/ Organization> I write to request your support for additional appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers Debris Removal Projects.

It has been brought to our attention that some funding has been allotted of the construction for a new debris removal vessel which will work in conjunction with the existing vessel the M/V Raccoon. We fully support this plan and sincerely hope that the funding can be found to rapidly complete this new vessel.

This winter while the M/V Raccoon was laid up in dry dock with a rudder problem there was virtually no debris removal and several of the fast ferries ingested debris in their water jet intakes causing delays and sometimes expensive diving operations. The debris removal projects are especially important to the new fast ferries plying San Francisco Bay providing an important and popular transportation alternative.

We also understand that the A.C.O.E. is severely understaffed at the Sausalito location because of recent budget cuts. We urge you to seek funding to alter this serious lack of manpower. Additionally we understand that there is talk of abolishing the GS-12 position of Chief of Navigation. This would be a huge loss as this is the person who coordinates the entire debris removal projects.

We are very concerned about cuts in Operation and Maintenance funding in the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works budget for port and harbor work. Local government and industry are working as cost-sharing partners with the federal government to fulfill our common interests in successful trade and commerce and commensurate environmental restoration. We believe cost-sharing is a fair and reasonable approach and deserves continued federal support.

Thank you for your consideration of these requests.

Sincerely yours,

<Your Name, Title, Company/Organization>

\*Note: Also address this letter to:

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein  
Attn: Gray Maxwell, Legislative Director  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Barbara Boxer  
Attn: Matthew Baumgart, Legislative Director  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

**DRAFT**  
**RESPONSE TO STCW 95 COMPLIANCE EXTENSION**

Date .....

Addressees .....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Dear .....

The Harbor Safety Committee (HSC) is pleased with the standards established in the STCW 95 compliance requirements and feels that they represent a tremendous benefit to the safety and efficiency of operations in our harbor. We agree that all seamen should be held to an equal standard in regard to safety of vessels on all waters of the world.

We are disappointed in the decision of the IMO to extend the deadline for compliance of STCW 95 to July 31, 2002.

In view of existing United States Homeland Security initiatives, it is essential that all mariners entering United States waters be properly qualified. It is regrettable that some flag states have not met the standards in the seven years allowed; United States mariners have met these requirements.

The Harbor Safety Committee of San Francisco strongly recommends that no further extension be granted.

Yours truly,