

**MINUTES
HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE
of the San Francisco Bay Region
11:30 a.m., Thursday, August 13, 1992
Board Room, Port of San Francisco, CA**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman, A. Thomas, at 1130, following the public workshop on the Interim Tug Escort Guidelines held by OSPR. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: Andrew Clark-Clough (alternate for Dave Adams), Port of Oakland; Gene Serex (alternate for James Faber), Port of Richmond; Roger Peters, Port of San Francisco; Alexander Krygsman, Port of Stockton; Joseph Gaidick, Port of Benicia; Morris Croce, Chevron Shipping; Mike Goebel (alternate for Dwight Koops), Exxon Shipping; John Gosling, Matson Navigation; Al Groh (alternate for Gunnar Lundeberg), Masters, Mates and Pilots; James Macaulay, Harbor Tug and Barge Company; Mary McMillan, Westar Marine Services; Burr Heneman (alternate for Ann Nothoff), Center for Marine Conservation; Joan Lundstrom, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Tom Rose, U. S. Navy Pilots; Max Blodgett, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, and federal government representatives Cmdr. Tom Gilmour and CMDR Thomas P. Dolan, U. S. Coast Guard. Also in attendance from OSPR, R. Dunstan, C. Raysbrook, and B. Leland. There were also many attendees from the general public.

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

3. The Chair noted that written comments in connection with the Interim Tug Escort Guidelines should be sent to: Department of Fish and Game, Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response, P. O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

4. The Chair called for a motion to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting. M. Croce noted that the minutes did not reflect the attendance of his alternate, Dennis Arnett, at the meeting of July 16. The MOTION was made by J. Lundstrom, seconded by A. Krygsman and passed unanimously to adopt the minutes as corrected.

5. T. Gilmour, U. S. Coast Guard, requested that he be allowed to give the Captain of the Port's report out of agenda order because of time restraints. As a result of OP 90 the rules have been changed such that work hour requirements for ships be extended to barges. There were six spills of 10 gallons or less since the last meeting. A pipeline break at Avila Beach Terminal 50, San Luis Obispo Bay, resulted in 150 - 200 barrels going into the water. The spill was well contained although there was a lack of near-shore equipment. A 500 gallon phosphoric acid spill in Oakland made water and got into the sewer system. It took two weeks to clean up the spill and return the water to a normal pH.

6. A. Thomas passed the Chair to J. Lundstrom so he could vote on adoption of sections of the Harbor Safety Plan. J. Lundstrom stated that the plan would be addressed section by section for a vote on the language and recommendation(s) in each.

7. J. Lundstrom stated that this draft, dated August 5, 1992, is the third version of the Harbor Safety Plan. The highlighted sections in the Table of Contents (1, 3, 5, and 7) and the Interim Tug Escort Guidelines were adopted at previous meetings. Appendices and additional language not included in earlier drafts is highlighted in the plan draft.

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region

August 13, 1992

8. Section 2; General Weather, Tide and Current and Depth Conditions. On pgs. 20 -23, new descriptive language was developed in concert with the San Francisco Bar Pilots and added to the plan to accurately describe the multiple weather systems of the area. A. Thomas discussed the recommended guidelines for movement of vessels during periods of minimum visibility on pg. 24. He noted that the first has been a truism since 1835 and the second is a distillation of what has proven to be safe practice. He stated that both should be incorporated into the plan. R. Peters asked if, regarding the first recommendation, language should be added to explain a possible conflict with tug escort guidelines. He asked if the recommendation in question would stand higher than the escort guidelines. A. Thomas responded that the purpose of this statement is to address the situation that exists on most foreign vessels. When a pilot boards the ship there is good communication with VTS, the pilot station, the Marine Exchange and other radio-equipped entities. This may not be true prior to that time because of language restrictions. When the pilot is aboard, the vessel is in a safer condition than if it is wandering around the Farallones. While it is up to the committee to decide on the relationship between the recommendation and tug escort guidelines, it is A. Thomas' opinion that it is safer to bring a vessel to safe anchorage inside the bay. This has been done without incident for years and years. B. Heneman asked if it would be a good idea to put the pilot on board to establish communication and then wait for tug escort. A. Thomas answered that personally he believes that it is safer, even with a pilot on board, to get the vessel to safe anchorage in zone 2. J. Macaulay added that the definition of restricted visibility does not preclude a tug escort standing by at the bridge. It is already spelled out in the plan that, if you move a tanker without a tug, you will be reported. If, as is typical, a ship arrives on time, an escort can be ready. He does not see a conflict. M. Croce agreed and added that restricted visibility at the bar does not necessarily mean there will be restricted visibility inside. He added that, as a general comment, it has been very evident throughout that the judgement of the master and pilot must prevail and he understands why the pilots want these recommendations in the plan. J. Lundstrom asked if the committee was ready for a vote on the first recommendation. MOTION by A. Thomas, seconded by R. Peters. Motion passed unanimously. J. Macaulay stated that the second recommendation on pg. 24 is common practice and an okay recommendation. MOTION by M. Croce, seconded by A. Thomas to adopt the second recommendation. Motion passed unanimously.

9. J. Lundstrom noted that the recommendation on pg. 26 concerning PORTS has already been adopted. MOTION by J. Lundstrom to add the following recommendations addressing COE surveys:

"The Committee recommends immediate surveys by the Corps of Engineers for Corps maintained deep-water navigation channels and by NOAA for all other channels used by deep draft vessels or oil barge traffic that have not been formerly surveyed within the last five years. Heavily traveled navigation lanes should be designated by the Corps of Engineers (COE) as project areas in order to ensure frequent, up-to-date surveys of channel depths. Of highest priority are those areas where known shoaling has taken place and where changes in bottom contours have been reported to differ by more than one foot from NOAA charts. Such areas would include shoaling areas east of Alcatraz and west of the Oakland Harbor.

The Committee further recommends that NOAA update its charts in a timely fashion to reflect survey information from NOAA, COE and independent sources. When surveyed channel depths vary more than one foot from a NOAA chart, such information should be provided to VTS (Coast Guard), masters and pilots of deep-draft vessels as soon as available. NOAA should improve the frequency of published data on channel depths in areas heavily trafficed by oil tankers and barges. NOAA should devise a system to quickly alert VTS, masters and pilots."

J. Macaulay concurred with the language and the motion was seconded by A. Thomas and passed unanimously.

10. A. Krygsman addressed the recommendation on pg. 27 regarding surveys to be conducted by facility owners/operators. He suggested that immediate soundings should only be taken where none have been taken in the past five years, a clarification not to redo recent work. Krygsman added that five years might be too long; A. Thomas stated that a shorter time period would be impractical. P. Dolan noted that the Coast Guard and NOAA would be conducting an open forum on Tuesday, August 18, with Lt. Miller representing NOAA. He added that Miller, Attaway and Young have conducted extensive surveys. NOAA wants the group that has been surveying

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
August 13, 1992

here to move north. It is P. Dolan's intention, acting on behalf of the Coast Guard, to try to get them permanently stationed here. This effort is more likely to be successful if members of the public ask for this in conjunction with requests from the Coast Guard and state. J. Macaulay made a MOTION to amend the recommendation including the clarifying language regarding five year recency of soundings. G. Serex asked if facility owners were being asked to survey currents. A. Thomas responded no; this committee is encouraging the establishment of the PORTS system. J. Lundstrom stated that it is the intent of the recommendation that facility operators survey depth and NOAA survey currents. The motion passed unanimously.

11.Pg. 29, Underkeel Clearance. It was agreed to delete paragraph 1 from the language because no sub-committee has discussed the issue or recommended the language. A. Krygsman noted that underkeel clearance has been flagged and will be addressed by the Pilotage Sub-Committee. There were no comments or corrections suggested for the remaining language on pgs. 27 - 29.

12. The Chair called for a lunch recess at 1200. The meeting reconvened at 1335.

13.A. Thomas returned to the recommendation on pg. 27, stating that the text is unclear as to who is responsible for surveying currents. The vote to adopt the recommendation was based on the understanding that NOAA and not terminal operators would have this responsibility. The text should be amended so that this is clear.

14.R. Peters pointed out that in Section III, pgs. 30 - 31, actual depths are given for Port of San Francisco waters, while project depths are given for other ports. J. Lundstrom stated that all citations were intended to be project depths. She noted that "actual depth" is a moving target. If corrections are needed so that all references are to project depths, they will be made. J. Macaulay referred to the last paragraph on pg. 31 concerning proposed channel deepening and asked what the projected depths are. M. Croce responded that projected depths should only be added to the language if the proposed deepening has been authorized. G. Serex added that getting authorization to deepen a channel doesn't necessarily mean that you will be able to make it happen. R. Peters suggested using the best information available concerning actuals, from a safety perspective. G. Serex suggested that channels are currently maintained at . . . J. Lundstrom stated that at earlier meetings people had agreed that depths change.

15.J. Lundstrom asked for comments or clarifications on pgs. 35 - 40. R. Peters stated that the reference on pg. 36 to Sonoma County should be Solano County. A. Thomas agreed. J. Lundstrom noted that the language on pg. 36 regarding lightering is new and relevant appendices will be included in the final draft. Coast Guard comments concerning corrective actions taken in response to accidents and near accidents in the past three years have been included on pgs. 38 - 40. J. Macaulay asked if the data regarding marine casualties have come from the Coast Guard. J. Lundstrom responded yes. He asked if Coast Guard data includes state pilots as well as federal pilots. A. Thomas responded that whether a vessel has a state or federal pilot on board all groundings, collisions and allisions must be reported to the Coast Guard. B. Leland added that this is a state regulation. M. Croce added that Title 46 requires that all vessels report such incidents. A. Thomas stated that if the committee wants minor incidents included, this information can be gleaned from the State Pilot Commission records. State pilots are required to report any and all incidents, no matter how minor, to the Commission. J. Macaulay stated that his point was to get supporting detail concerning near misses. J. Lundstrom noted that under accidents and near misses the Coast Guard cautions that their reports may not be complete, particularly as to cause. Perhaps a standardized system for categorizing accidents and near misses can be developed. J. Lundstrom suggested that the Coast Guard and VTS could forward all accident reports to OSPR on an annual basis. A. Thomas stated that the National Academy of Science Committee on Navigational Science and Piloting recommended that the Coast Guard look for a more consistent way of reporting. Data and numbers can be interpreted in different ways to come to different conclusions. Such as in the case of the AIMS supported Booze-Allen Study which found federal pilots to have a

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
August 13, 1992

better safety record than state pilots. While the Batelle Study, commissioned by the American Pilots Association, using the same data came to the opposite conclusion. A. Thomas urged the committee to accept J. Lundstrom's recommendation that the Coast Guard work to perfect their data gathering and analysis of accidents and near misses. J. Lundstrom made a MOTION to add the following recommendation to pg. 40. J. Macaulay seconded the motion and it passed. "The Coast Guard and VTS should devise a more consistent system of reporting accidents and near accidents standardized with other areas. The annual reports should together be analyzed on an annual basis by the service and a report made to OSPR with recommendations on the effectiveness of harbor safety measures taken."

16. J. Lundstrom noted that the language regarding small vessels on pgs. 40 - 42 has been in the plan document since the original June version. There is a new recommendation at the bottom of pg. 42 regarding herring fishermen which should go to the bottom of pg. 44 with similar recommendations. R. Peters stated that the Port of San Francisco has a lot of concern regarding the herring fleet and would like to be part of any planned meetings with fleet representatives. J. Lundstrom suggested adding "and representatives of the ports" to the language covering participants at these meetings. G. Serex suggested changing the language "avoid problems" to "avoid navigational conflicts". B. Leland noted that a coordinator will be appointed to address this issue under the Commercial Fishing Safety Act. J. Lundstrom added that the Coast Guard is addressing regulations regarding where herring boats can position themselves and how nets should be lit. A. Krygsman made a MOTION to adopt the recommendation concerning interaction with the herring fishermen with the Lundstrom and Serex changes. J. Gosling seconded the motion and it passed.

17. J. Lundstrom stated that the six recommendations beginning at the bottom of pg. 44 came from the Koops/Brown sub-committee. Regarding the first and second recommendations, A. Krygsman and M. Croce asked if St. Francis Yacht Club had agreed to this arrangement. A. Thomas noted that the purpose of these recommendations is for representatives from industry and the yachting community to experience each other's perspective. J. Weiss, San Francisco Bar Pilot, stated that it might not be safe to have onboard visitors observing tanker operations. A. Thomas responded that the oil companies, in particular Exxon, have been inviting interested persons on board to gain an understanding of the operation. M. Croce stated that his company would not mind if the observers were accompanied by pilots. J. Lundstrom suggested adding the language "if practicable" at the end of the first two recommendations. A. Krygsman asked R. Dunstan if these recommendations would be sent back because they are not specific as to who would actually do the observing. R. Dunstan said he didn't believe recommendations such as these need to be that specific. A. Krygsman made a MOTION to adopt the first two recommendations as amended. The motion was seconded by R. Peters and passed.

18. The third recommendation on pg. 44 refers to yacht racing schedules. M. Croce asked how these schedules would be produced. R. Peters responded that M. Brown has said she will see it happens. R. Peters asked if the Yacht Racing Association of San Francisco Bay is the only group staging races here. It was agreed that all races would be calendared. M. Croce made a MOTION to adopt the third and fourth recommendations, A. Krygsman seconded it and it passed.

19. It was asked what "Committee" is referred to in the fifth recommendation. A. Thomas responded the Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region. M. Croce asked about the tentative agreement referred to. A. Thomas answered that M. Brown was working on that and she isn't here today. In connection with the sixth recommendation, M. Croce asked what can be done in response to an infraction, take the boat. G. Serex suggested removing the offender from the race. A. Krygsman suggested adding "each" in front of race committee in the fifth recommendation. G. Serex stated that what is needed is a commitment from the yacht racing committees to back up complainants. J. Macaulay reiterated the question, "What can you do against a yacht owner?" B. Leland added that it is hard for someone on a large ship to identify a small craft. M. Croce made a MOTION to table the discussion and vote on adoption of the fifth recommendation until M. Brown is in attendance. J. Macaulay seconded the motion and it passed.

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region

August 13, 1992

20.G. Serex made a MOTION to adopt the sixth recommendation. It was seconded by M. Croce and passed. J. Lundstrom noted additional recommendations under education on pg. 48 which relate to the above issues.

21.J. Lundstrom noted that added language on pg. 47 is a restatement of current practice. J. Macaulay asked P. Dolan about contingency routing and whether it shouldn't be restated and included in the plan. P. Dolan responded that the language is on the shelf and doesn't need to go into the plan. A. Thomas noted that there is a major difference between San Francisco and Long Beach. The close confines of Long Beach makes dispersal of vessels more important. J. Macaulay stated that a dispersal plan can be added later. R. Peters stated that he doesn't like the word "extensive" in the recommendation on pg. 47 and would like to see it dropped so dredging isn't delayed. There was a MOTION by A. Thomas and seconded by M. Croce to adopt the recommendation as amended.

22. There were no comments or changes to the new language on pg. 47 regarding education. Concerning the recommendation on pg. 48, A. Krygsman asked if the committee is asking billing departments of marinas to do a mailing every month. J. Lundstrom suggested striking "every month". R. Peters and A. Krygsman agreed. There was a MOTION by A. Thomas, seconded by J. Macaulay to adopt the recommendation as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

23.Recommendations on pg. 49. A. Krygsman asked how the first recommendation would happen. A. Thomas responded that it already does happen. MOTION by M. Croce, seconded by A. Thomas and passed to adopt the first recommendation. To the second recommendation M. Croce agreed with publishing punitive actions but suggested striking "and broadcast". MOTION by A. Krygsman, seconded by M. Croce to adopt the amended recommendation. Motion passes. R. Peters asked how the committee would support the outlined efforts. He suggested changing the word "support" to "encourage". MOTION by A. Thomas, seconded by R. Peters to adopt the final recommendation on pg. 49 as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

24.J. Lundstrom would like to add the following language regarding boardsailors. "Representatives of the Harbor Safety Committee should meet with representatives of the San Francisco Boardsailing Association to promote safer navigation in the Bay by discussing such issues as boardsailing race schedules, race course locations, Inland Steering and Sailing Rule 9 requirements, characteristics of large vessels and tug/barge operations in the Central Bay in relation to boardsailors, and possible education efforts such as posting signs at areas frequented by large numbers of board sailors such as Crissy Field to warn of vessel traffic dangers." MOTION by A. Krygsman, seconded by J. Macaulay to add the foregoing recommendation. Motion passes.

25.J. Lundstrom noted that she would also like to address jet skiers, but how do you go about meeting them?

26.J. Macaulay stated that, on pg. 52, the plan should give center span clearances for each notation to maintain consistency. A. Thomas suggested leaving the data as presented for informational purposes. It could read from A to B, 174' - 217'. A. Krygsman stated the belief that no ship will consult the plan for this type of information. J. Macaulay stated that he would just like to see consistency. The issue will be addressed later.

27.J. Macaulay asked about the status of the Coast Guard study concerning aids to navigation referred to in the new language at the bottom of pg. 55. P. Dolan responded that it is in process.

28.J. Macaulay asked if (b) on pg. 60 covers military and public/civilian vessels. M. Croce responded that, by law, military vessels are exempt. J. Lundstrom stated that she would like to specify all/both types of vessels. A. Thomas

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
August 13, 1992

stated that he would like to add to (a) to include international procedures as alluded to in the Vancouver VTS symposium so that there would be international standardization. MOTION by A. Thomas, seconded by J. Gosling to adopt the recommendations as amended under Scope of Coverage. Motion passes.

29.Pg. 61, J. Weiss suggested changing the 12 knot speed limit to "safe speed". M. Croce stated that the intention of the committee is to achieve optimum vessel maneuverability. 90% of the vessels on the bay travel in excess of 12 knots. He asked if it is the opinion of this committee that they should not be doing so. A. Groh agreed with J. Weiss that you cannot specify speed limits. A. Thomas stated that this issue came up at the Vancouver symposium and various countries do not want to be limited as to vessel speed. J. Gosling asked what they have done. A. Thomas responded that they use the term "safe speed". A. Krygsman made a MOTION to remove the 12 knot speed limit, seconded by M. Croce. J. Lundstrom asked how it would read if it said "at a safe speed". R. Peters asked if paragraph (a) does anything. A. Krygsman stated that it is already a requirement. Paragraph (a) is deleted by consensus of the committee.

30.P. Dolan noted that under "scope of coverage", paragraph (a), he cannot agree with the language without seeing a second clarifying paragraph as he is charged with local rulemaking. The Appendix M referred to is out of date.

31.Pg. 61, paragraph (d); B. Heneman would like stronger language which identifies what equipment and what it will do. M. Croce agreed. A. Thomas stated that if the language is too specific, something may be left out. MOTION by A. Krygsman, seconded by J. Macaulay to adopt the recommendation as written. Motion passes.

32.J. Lundstrom asked if the added language on pg. 68 accurately reflects the action taken by the committee at the July meeting. R. Peters stated that in paragraph 1, pg. 68, the sentence beginning "The statutory requirement to examine this issue is based on . . ." should be completed with the phrase "a legislative finding . . ." and the word "premise" should be deleted. At the end of paragraph 3, there should be a sentence reading "The Interim Tug Escort Guidelines were adopted by the Harbor Safety Committee for the San Francisco Bay Region on March 12, 1992." Further language should be added, "An annotated set of guidelines are set forth below". This second sentence is important because a very specific document was sent to Sacramento. A. Krygsman asked why not replace the current language in the plan draft with the actual language sent to Sacramento. R. Peters responded that the legislation requires rationale in the plan which was not included in the interim guidelines sent to OSPR. J. Macaulay stated that the last sentence in the first paragraph, pg. 68, should read "loss of steering or propulsion." R. Peters stated that the first sentence in the new language in the fourth paragraph, pg. 68 should read "The tug escort subcommittee intends to (~~strike~~ "will examine the full range") examine issues associated . . ." The expression "will examine full range" sounds like going back to square one on every issue. Regarding the new language in the shaded area, pgs. 68 - 69, the gist of the workshop was to turn guidelines into regulations! The guidelines will or will not become regulations. The last sentence in the paragraph at the top of pg. 69 should be deleted and replaced with "The Harbor Safety Committee has asked for voluntary compliance with the interim guidelines once they have received OSPR approval."

33.Pg. 69, in the heading Proposed Interim Guidelines, strike "Proposed" and insert "Annotated"; as suggested by R. Peters.

34.R. Peters, pg. 73 (G), paragraph 1, delete "one of".

35.A. Thomas asked about the relationship between text language and the map regarding geographical scope. R. Peters responded that the language goes to the map, i.e., the intent was for the boundary between zones to be south of Anchorage 9. R. Peters stated that the map should fit the text or the text should fit the map. A. Thomas responded that the text should reflect the map as shown. J. Macaulay stated that either longitude and latitude designations or a line between points A and B should be used. R. Peters responded that the feedback from the

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
August 13, 1982

state has been that the map/chart is clear as to the intended geographical areas. If the intent is to regulate vessels at Anchorage 9, zones 2, 3, and 4 could be merged.

36.Pg. 68, B. Heneman suggested reversing the last two sentences in the first paragraph.

37.The Chair called for a ten minute recess to begin at 3:20. Meeting reconvened at 3:30.

38.Pg. 78, Pilotage. The Pilotage Sub-Committee has had one meeting on pilotage and underkeel clearance issues. Per T. Rose, Pg. 77, strike "both" "and military"; leaving "The U. S. Navy employs civilian pilots to pilot Navy ships. Correct the number of pilots who operate on the bay who have federal licenses from 4 to 5. In the same paragraph on Navy Pilots change the final sentence to read "The Navy requires federal licenses to pilot and maintains published standards for experience and training.

39.A. Krygsman noted that additional items to be studied by the sub-committee are listed on pg. 78. New language regarding recommendations concerning pilotage, pg. 79. R. Paetzols, attorney for the State Board of Pilot Commissioners, requested that "if warranted" be added to the paragraph which begins "The subcommittee will review the following issues in more detail and will make further recommendations, if warranted, to be included in future updates of the Harbor Safety Plan".

40.Captain David Gates, San Francisco Bar Pilots, read a statement into the record, which is included as an addendum to these minutes. V. Bakken, federal pilot requested an opportunity for rebuttal. M. Croce offered to produce the Booze-Allen Study; A. Krygsman noted that his sub-committee already has the report. J. Lundstrom stated that the Pilotage Sub-Committee has only met once and this is not the time to address issues other than with a broad brush to touch upon them in the first plan. V. Bakken stated that he is in 100% agreement with D. Gates regarding the caliber of state pilots, however, you cannot look at federal pilots as a group and discriminate because each individual federal pilot sets his/her own goals. He noted that he made 4,000 trips while working on this bay under his federal license. J. Weiss, San Francisco Bar Pilot, stated that he would like to make a statement for the record on the pilot training program and entrance criteria. A. Krygsman, Chairman of the Pilotage Sub-Committee accepted the statement in written form.

41.Pg. 79, first recommendation. J. Lundstrom stated that an oversight in law which has been grandfathered in (although it is not currently being used) would allow a janitor to operate a ship. M. Croce responded that this was not an oversight. The law was looked at for several months before Section 1179 was implemented, which happened when all agreed that the intent was to conform to the system which was working. J. Lundstrom withdrew the term "oversight". M. Croce noted that Chevron is the only company now using its own pilots under this law. A. Thomas responded that any company that expressed its intent before 1984 could at some future date employ their own pilots. A. Krygsman stated that the intent is to tighten up the law. M. Croce responded that the recommendation does more than that; it pre-empts Chevron from doing what it does now with its own docking masters. MOTION by J. Macaulay to refer the recommendation back to the sub-committee, seconded by M. MacMillan and passed with the Chair abstaining.

42.Pg. 79, second recommendation. P. Moloney stated that, the way the text reads, barges would need a pilot; it would be better if the pilot were on the tug. M. MacMillan asked if you have a tug escort on a barge, do you need a pilot? J. Macaulay responded that current Coast Guard regulations cover the need for local knowledge and this committee cannot circumvent federal regulations. If the captain of the tug has a federal license, Coast Guard regulations are met. A. Thomas stated that, since the mid-1800's the mandate has been for state control of pilotage. In the last twelve years federal regulations have come to include masters with federal pilots' licenses under Coast Guard jurisdiction. If the states, including Oregon and Washington, agree, there will be an opportunity to override federal regulations. If this will increase safety on the bay, it is vital to apprise OSPR of the state pilot vs. federal

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region
August 13, 1992

pilot issue. J. Macaulay stated the opinion that this is an attack on the local tug and barge industry. The simulator training referred to in the testimony given by D. Gates has nothing to do with tugs and barges. The Coast Guard and others recognize that tug/barge operators know much more about the idiosyncracies of their own vessels than most pilots. He recommends removal of the second recommendation (pg. 79) from the plan. A question from the floor addressed the issue of whether a master of a tug and barge could currently bring the tug/barge into the bay. A. Thomas responded yes; current regulations do not require a tug escort or pilot, but the state may. M. Croce stated that he sees the issue as whether or not these persons can qualify themselves to bring barges in: is J. Macaulay saying there is no jurisdiction. J. Macaulay responded that this is a much bigger issue than tugs and barges; it addresses the issue of state vs. federal pilots. V. Bakken stated that Crowley may have great masters, but what about the other companies. He (Bakken) had to pull barges directed by out-of-state pilots from groundings ten times in the eight years he worked the bay. G. Skarich stated that she brought up this issue in a sub-committee meeting because an East Coast barge came in with a master unfamiliar with the grounds, but may now be sorry she did. She was looking to make sure people without certain types/numbers of trips (local knowledge) didn't bring barges in - not every tug and barge needs a pilot. A. Groh commented that the mission is to address the safe carriage of fuel in and out of the bay. If the recommendation is that tugs towing barges carrying in excess of 5,000 metric tons of oil or petroleum products need an escort then he proposed that the recommendation be adopted. A. Krygsman stated that the intent wasn't that tugs/barges with qualified masters need a pilot. J. Macaulay noted that the masters who have licenses which so state their qualifications leaves out those who only document their trips - there are lots of barges moving on the bay over 5,000 metric tons. J. Gosling asked how those masters keep track of their trips (recency/local knowledge). J. Macaulay responded that each master keeps his own records and the local company keeps logs. A. Krygsman stated that it was the intent of the Pilotage Sub-Committee to be consistent with escort regulations. G. Skarich suggested that this recommendation go back to the sub-committee for further consideration with the note that piloting a barge is very difficult and different from piloting a tanker. She would like the committee to clarify the language and look at the justifications. A. Krygsman, sub-committee chair, agrees. D. Luce asked how the interested public could obtain copies of the text of the Gates and Weiss testimony. The Chair referred him to the Marine Exchange.

41. Section 10, pg. 80; no comments or corrections. Section 11, pg. 80; no comments or corrections. Section 12, pg. 81. J. Mes, sub-committee chair not present to comment. P. Motoney noted that the "recommendation" in this section, found on pg. 82, is really a statement and not a recommendation. A. Thomas responded that when J. Mes reported at an earlier meeting he addressed the problems created by duplicative inspections and asked that this committee make a recommendation to alleviate the situation - this is a rewording of that request. MOTION by B. Heneman, seconded by A. Krygsman to adopt the recommendation. Motion passed.

42. The Harbor Safety Plan will go to OSPR as adopted to date, with the deletions as noted, and will also come back to the committee. J. Macaulay, shouldn't further review/revision of the plan become part of the annual process. A. Krygsman asked R. Dunstan if the committee was limited to yearly review/revision. R. Dunstan responded no.

43. The Chair noted that considerable work has been done and soon OSPR will have the plan document. A. Thomas noted that he will be out of state for the next several weeks; A. Nothoff, if she is back from vacation, or J. Lundstrom will expedite completion of the final draft for submission to OSPR.

44. UNFINISHED BUSINESS. R. Peters asked if committee members could get copies of the state report which describes the process from here. R. Dunstan answered that all committee members would receive a copy.

45. NEW BUSINESS. None.

46. TUG ESCORT SUB-COMMITTEE, R. Peters. This morning the state conducted a workshop on the interim tug escort guidelines; an annotated version would go into the plan. Now the Tug Escort Sub-Committee would like

Harbor Safety Committee of the San Francisco Bay Region

August 13, 1992

to discuss moving forward on permanent guidelines. B. Heneman requested that additional items be added to the list of items to be studied: which are regulated vessels/double hulled, etc., and an expanded geographical scope between zones 2 and 5. R. Peters agreed that the sub-committee will add these two items. The Chair asked if it was the will of the committee to accept the outline. There were no objections and the outline/timeline was accepted by the full committee.

47. The next meeting will be held at 9:30 a.m., Marina Bay Boathouse. Richmond, September 9, 1992.

48. MOTION to adjourn by M. Croce, seconded by A. Groh. Meeting adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Hunter

Terry Hunter
Secretariat

