

MINUTES

HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

10:00 a.m., Thursday, September 12, 1996

Port of Richmond, Harbor Masters' Office, 1340 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA

1. The public meeting was called to order by Chair, Arthur Thomas, San Francisco Bar Pilots, at 10:10. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: Dave Adams, Port of Oakland; Margot Brown, National Boating Federation; Maurice Croce, Chevron Shipping; Rich Smith (alternate for Dwight Koops), SeaRiver Maritime; Lynn Korwatch (alternate for John Gosling), Matson Navigation Company; Michael Nerney, Inchcape Williams-Diamond; Gunnar Lundeberg, Sailors Union of the Pacific; Scott Merritt, Foss Maritime; James Mes, Transmarine Navigation; Mary McMillan, Westar Marine Services; Joan Lundstrom, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Roger Peters, Member at Large; U. S. Coast Guard representatives, Capt. D. P. Montoro (MSO) and Cmdr. Dennis Sobeck (VTS); and OSPR representatives, Bud Leland and Marian Ashe. Also in attendance, more than thirty representatives of the interested public.
2. T. Hunter, Marine Exchange, confirmed that a quorum was present.
3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.** Corrections to the minutes of 6-13-96. J. Lundstrom, p. 4, the Underwater Rocks Sub-Committee meeting was also attended by representatives of the California State Department of Fish and Game. The later reference to State Fish and Wildlife should be State Fish and Game. D. Sobeck corrected the spelling of Capt. Jim Ruthowski's name and noted that he was only in SF for two days, not four weeks. B. Leland noted that OSPR Administrator Bontadelli is assisting the new Director of Fish and Game, not training him; and, on the last page, industry-led drills, not preparations, were conducted on 8-8-96. MOTION by M. Brown, seconded by R. Peters "to approve the minutes of 6-13-96 as corrected." Motion passed without objection.
4. In opening remarks, the Chair noted that, during the HSC's summer hiatus, OSPR and OAL completed the process of converting the tug escort guidelines submitted to OSPR into regulatory language.
5. **COAST GUARD COTP'S REPORT, D. Montoro.** The COTP introduced Lt. Cmdr. Chip Sharpe, District Aids to Navigation, with members of his staff, Dawn Salsbury and Brian Tetro; and Cmdr. Rob Lorigan, Chief of Port Operations, MSO, replacing Lt. Cmdr. Sharon Richey. (1) Written reports of pollution statistics and significant port safety events for the period 6-1-96 through 8-31 -96 are made a part of these minutes and were briefly reviewed by D. Montoro. There were five propulsion and three steering casualties during the summer, all of which involved partial, not total, failures. (2) Copies of new federal regulations regarding underkeel clearance were distributed (33 CFR 157.455). The provisions of the regulations give the COTP the authority to set underkeel clearance guidelines for the local port under his jurisdiction. It is D. Montoro's intention to mirror the recommendations in the Harbor Safety Plan. He wants to look at the plan and resulting regulations and then publish COTP regulations after reviewing necessary changes in definitions. He recommended reconstituting the HSC sub-committee that addressed underkeel clearance and suggested that Cmdr. Lorigan be the CG representative to that sub-committee. D. Montoro proposes to establish minimum regulations for the SF Bay Area. Masters will then calculate underkeel clearance to meet the standards of their company and the COTP. (3) A tow boat safety program is being initiated with a straw man proposal for input. The intent is to focus on prevention-through-people type issues, such as crew fatigue and training, etc. The first meeting is scheduled for 10-

15-96 at 1000 hours on Coast Guard Island. (4) A local ballast water survey was conducted last month to look at the exchange program participation – who did, who didn't and why.

6. CLEARINGHOUSE REPORT, T. Hunter. (1) Statistical reports for the months of June, July and August and year-to-date are made a part of these minutes. (2) There were three occasions to report regulated transits that did not check in with the Clearing House since 6-1-96. All involved tug-and-barges, where one or the other didn't check in. (3) There has been a slight upward trend in tanker arrivals and a noticeable rise in the number of shifts.

7. OSPR REPORT, B. Leland. (1) Public Affairs has published a boating safety hand-out, which will be distributed to the boating community by M. Brown of the National Boating Federation. Copies were distributed to those interested. (2) Pilotage issues. SB 1641 (Marks), establishing mandatory pilotage for the SF Bay Area, has been chaptered and is on the Governor's desk for signature. It establishes a recognized state program in the eyes of the 11th Coast Guard District. The rest of the port districts in the state will be working with the 11th Coast Guard District to reach district specific MOUs. (3) OSPR secured a contract with NOAA to buy \$50,000 worth of communications equipment for PORTS. The Administrator has agreed to commit OSPR to work with the SF Bay Area maritime community to develop a means of supporting the system when NOAA withdraws federal funds. \$300,000 a year in maintenance costs can be paid from the interest off the pollution response fund. The MX will be the central hub in arranging meetings of interested parties to put together a funding package for PORTS. A spot bill has been created to address this issue. The plan should be completed before NOAA concludes the demonstration project.

(4) The tug escort regulations package is out for a fifteen day comment period, on the last leg of the regulatory process. B. Leland deferred to M. Ashe to report. It is now the middle of the comment period on changes since the last 45-day comment period. Comments on the changed text should be submitted by 9-20-96. M. Ashe provided an overview of the changes that resulted from the two hundred comments received during the 45-day period. (a) The Pilots role in the review of the escort plan. The intent is to maintain the pilots' responsibility to review the escort plan without imposing liability. If the proposed escort plan is not adequate the pilot will contact the MX, who in turn with report to the Administrator of OSPR for a determination. M. Croce asked what would happen if an inbound ship does not have an adequate plan. M. Ashe responded that it would be handled on a case-by-case basis. D. Montoro added that he is not sure the Administrator is in a position to direct traffic. M. Ashe responded that the liability has been taken off the pilot and put on the Administrator, but the pilot still reviews the plan prior to transit. B. Leland added that the legislation does not give the Administrator additional authority to direct the movement of vessels. If there is an inadequate escort plan, the same enforcement response as now would be employed. The report of an inadequate plan would go to the Administrator, who would dispatch an investigator, probably after the inbound vessel ties up. If the inadequate escort plan indicates danger to the vessel or escort tugs the traditional responsibilities of the master and pilot would apply. M. Croce stated that the regulations are then punitive rather than preventative. Maybe the pilot should advise the master that he is not in compliance and the master should go to anchor. B. Leland responded that it is expected that before the pilot calls the MX, he would indicate the non-compliance to the master. M. Ashe added that, in the previous version, the pilot would stop the tanker. In the revised language, the pilot is no longer responsible for stopping the tanker, as recommended by the HSC. M. Croce is concerned that this change takes away the teeth of the preventative measures intended. The whole point of having an escort plan is to prevent disaster. M. Ashe stated that the assumption is made that most vessels will complete an

adequate plan, aside from a few technical details the first time or two. M. Croce asked what the pilot does if the tug is too small and the master disagrees. A. Thomas responded that, under the old language, the pilot would stop the vessel. If this action was proven unnecessary in retrospect, the pilot would be stuck with the resultant charges to the vessel. With the new language, it needs to be stressed that there are preventative measures in place for substandard vessels with substandard equipment. During normal bridge procedures the pilot reviews the escort plan and, if it is inadequate, the rules say that the pilot will call the MX immediately. Besides being an advisor to the master, the pilot is the officer directing the movement of the vessel. He added that, as a pilot, he would not proceed with a substandard escort plan or equipment, but rather call the USCG so that something could be done immediately with federal backing. Perhaps there could be an arrangement with the CG as well as the MX, so that a COTP order would be directed to the substandard vessel. D. Montoro responded that the COTP can't enforce state law and vice versa. He believes there would be a problem with an MOU between the state and federal governments on this issue. J. Lundstrom asked, if a private individual does not have the authority to stop a tanker with an inadequate plan, who has the authority? D. Montoro asked what would prevent the pilot from staying on board until the necessary corrections were made or alternatively, if the pilot left the vessel and it was required to stay outside until the corrections were made. A. Thomas stated that a routine method is needed for handling the oddball inadequate ship. M. Croce and D. Montoro suggested the possibility of an internal pilot organization rule. A. Thomas suggested P. Moloney take the issue back to the Pilot Commission for development of regulatory language. T. Hunter stated that the situation has come up before and it is not completely codified. When there is a non-match, the MX advises the pilot that the planned tug is not available or is out of compliance. The pilot and master then have to make the choice as to whether to go to anchor or not bring the vessel in.

Continuing with changes since the last comment period, (b). The escort plan. There were comments from folks that didn't want to use a checklist and turn it in every transit. In addition it was reported that the checklist doesn't meet the needs or fit the operations of specific operators. The new language provides that an operator can submit a plan to the Administrator for approval, to be reviewed by the pilot and master prior to each transit. B. Leland endorses the development of guidelines for how to proceed in the rare occasion where problems with the plan come up. There needs to be a phase-in period to see that the crews and masters are trained. It can't all be done by 1-1-97.

(c) The fourth crew member aboard the escort tug. The first language referred to an engineer, then it was changed to refer to a person qualified to address mechanical difficulties on the escort vessel. During the comment period, it was emphasized that this person was aboard to respond to an emergency and should be immediately available to respond to mechanical difficulties aboard the tug, but not necessarily be awake and alert. The change in language is from *all crew members awake and alert* to a *fourth crew member immediately available*. G. Lundeberg is opposed to compromising safety to save the operators a few dollars in crew pay.

(d) Dual failure versus single failure. In responding to comments on this issue, the Administrator felt that the HSC's justification for using the single failure scenario was substantiated. The plan as a whole and any casualties in US waters will be reviewed over the next two years as part of an overall program review. This process will not summarily sunset any provisions of the tug escort regulations.

A. Thomas directed attention to p. 19, the change in 5(c)(3), where "towline with *a breaking strength* that is 2.5 times the certified braking force of the escort tug" has been changed to "towline with a *safe*

working load that is 2.5 times the certified braking force of the escort tug”. M. Ashe stated that she found this recommended change that was not made in the earlier version of the tug escort regulations when she was reviewing minutes of the HSC. This was a recommendation of the HSC that was overlooked in prior changes. R. Smith disagreed with taking “safe working load” and multiplying it by 2.5. He will submit his comments to OSPR in writing. A. Thomas agreed that it is important that the language read “2.5 times the braking force”. The alternative equipment, as currently defined in the language, is not available or produced. He added that, if it is the consensus of the HSC that the prior language is the intent of the committee, the Chair will ask S. Merritt to convey this to OSPR on behalf of the committee during the comment period. There was no objection.

M. Ashe stated that all changes, other than the four discussed here, were made for clarification and did not made any changes in intent. The regulatory language should be to OAL before the end of this month. M. Croce asked if there is a phase-in period for some of the provisions. M. Ashe responded that if this is seen to be necessary it should be noted in comments.

J. Lundstrom asked how members of the maritime industry who have not participated in the development of tug escort regulations will be advised that the regulations are in place. T. Hunter responded that the MX notified all member agents, carriers and tug companies when the last regulations passed and will do the same notice to the full mailing list for the current package. R. Peters thanked M. Ashe on behalf of the entire committee for all her hard work.

8. TUG ESCORT SUB-COMMITTEE. R. Peters stated that his intent had been to defer to OSPR for comments on the changes as presented today by M. Ashe. Based on this and a preliminary reading, the intent of this committee is as closely approximated in regulatory language as is possible. He asked if the members of the HSC felt compelled to make a written statement on the package for the record or leave written comment to individuals with specific issues to address. The issues of rope strength and how to proceed in the event of an inadequate escort plan would be best handled by experienced and qualified individuals. The HSC is most concerned with the possibility of a regulatory void, however, OSPR understands that and extension of the emergency regulations should be contemplated if necessary. OSPR’s interest in this regard is the same as the TES and HSC. The Chair believes that representatives of the TES, Clearing House, OSPR, and San Francisco Bar Pilots should sit in a room with the proposed regulations and minor changes and work out the practicalities of implementation procedures. He asked the Chair of the TES to call for such a meeting in short order. Cal Burke suggested that a knowledgeable group sit down to look at the proposed regulatory package and see if it is workable. M. Brown asked if the meeting proposed by the Chair needed to be publicly noticed. If so, it would not be possible to meet before the end of the comment period on the changes to the proposed regulations. M. Ashe responded that public notice would not be necessary because the proposed meeting would only address issues of implementation. R. Peters added that the meeting would not need to be publicly noticed because participation would be limited to those involved in the practicalities of implementing the regulations. The Chair withdrew his request to the Chair of the TES and asked the MX to hose a meeting of its members to address implementation. R. Smith suggested this group look at the issue of matching tugs to ships with anticipated currents when the transit is delayed with resulting increase in currents. How would this be handled? M. Croce asked if the intent of the work at the proposed meeting was to go into a technical review of tug/tanker matching. The Chair responded that some of those types of issues need to be aired. Those implementing the regulations need to take a close look at what is involved. The Chair suggested that M. Croce attend the meeting as host of the Glostien Study. T. Hunter emphasized that the focus of

this meeting would be to look at the practical side now that policies have been established. The Chair echoed R. Peters' thanks to M. Ashe and B. Leland. The OAL will have 30 working days from receipt of the regulatory package to accept it, etc.

9. The Chair introduced Capt. Ken Graham, retired Long Beach pilot and former Chair of the LA/LB HSC, who now resides in the SF Bay Area.

10. **PORTS SUB-COMMITTEE**, D. Adams. (1) B. Leland addressed the bottom line in his OSPR Report. Representatives of the MX and OSPR met with A. Thomas and D. Adams on 8-23-96 pursuant to a proposal for funding of PORTS authored by R. Peters for the sub-committee. OSPR is looking for 100% appropriated funding and will need facts and input to develop a package. R. Peters added that OSPR has embraced the PORTS project and sees the benefits as reaching far beyond those who attend the HSC meetings to include fishermen and academicians as well. OSPR is looking at drawing from revenues of the California General Fund and OSPR funds. A briefing will be conducted later today. In the near future, meetings will be held with state representatives to develop an outreach program to get as many people on board as possible, to avoid legislative problems later. A meeting will be held with the Administrator of OSPR soon to determine who authors and carries the necessary bill. D. Adams asked if a letter recapping the 8-23-96 meeting has been received and T. Hunter responded yes. A spot bill, place holder legislation, is in place for the next session (2) D. Adams reported on a proposed Port of Oakland project to address underkeel clearance. They are currently awaiting a COE proposal to do a squat research project aboard vessel(s) using GPS vertical measurement. The Port of Oakland could invite companies to participate and get real time profiles of specific vessels in Oakland Inner Harbor. M. Croce stated that Chevron would be more than glad to participate. (3) D. Adams deferred to Capt. Tom Richards who introduced Dave McKinnie, National Geodetic Survey, Photogrammetry Division; DeWitt John, Director, National Academy of Public Administration, Center for Competitive Sustainable Economics; Mike Henderson and Linda Maxin, NOAA Headquarters, Washington, D. C. D. John is in the SF Bay Area looking at how NOAA staff working on the PORTS demonstration project is working with the local community. (4) The Golden Gate sensor is in place in 300' of water and is working perfectly. (5) A flyer is distributed today instructing users how to reach PORTS by phone or the Internet. The marine weather radio broadcast gives PORTS' data updated each hour. PORTS information available by phone and the Internet is updated every six minutes. The focus of work the past summer addressed the issues of configuration and distribution of PORTS' data. (6) Alternate ways of communicating with Richmond Long Wharf equipment are being looked at. Anyone who knows who has jurisdiction or ownership of Red Rock should advise T. Richards. (7) T. Richards would like information on the proposed Pt. Molate off-shore oil terminal. If the PORTS' current sensor in is the wrong place and may be dredged up during construction of this facility, he needs to know. (8) The technology is available to put GPS equipment on a ship to measure squat. T. Richards is working with the COE, the Port of Oakland and NOAA. (9) NOAA is going to contract for 100% multi-beam surveys for FY 97. The highest priority is the areas north and east of Alcatraz. (10) Two aircraft were in the SF Bay Area and took aerial photos at low altitudes, with high resolution, of the Oakland, Richmond and Carquinez Straits areas. The purpose was to get high resolution photographs for docking charts to be used with electronic charts equipment. There was phenomenal support from the oil companies.

11. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** J. Lundstrom's memo to the HSC dated 9-9-96 lists possible topics for HSC focus and work in the future. (1) Tug Escort. R. Peters reported that the TES submitted three recommendations for the 1996 plan update. (a) Taking the guidelines to regulation. This project is near

completion. (2) Creation of a sub-committee, more technically composed than the TES, to look at specific waterway practices. These issues were difficult to incorporate into the tug escort program when guidelines were being developed. There was always strong interest in this aspect of the program by D. Montoro. Now, with the regulatory process nearly complete, it is time to address this. R. Peters recommends arrangements be made with D. Montoro to put this on the agenda for the October HSC meeting. (c) Support of the risk analysis study being undertaken by NOS, NOAA, the USCG and the COE. T. Richards reported that the contracting was done with MIT, to be funded by a NOAA Sea Grant for \$250,000 and federal contracts with Research and Development, the Waterways Experimental Station and NOAA. The Sea Grant money is still in place, but federal cut-backs have forced the three federal agencies (R&D, WES and NOAA) to pull back from support of the study. Looking historically, preliminary discussions indicate that, while the risks and dangers of SF Bay would have led to a higher incidence of casualties, this was not the case. Community involvement, work like that of the HSC and the expertise of the San Francisco Bar Pilots are factors thought to have mediated the dangers. The progress of the risk analysis study is now floundering, however, data has been gathered for SF, NY and the Houston-Galveston areas.

(2) *[from the Lundstrom memo]* Revision of Off-shore Approach Lanes to San Francisco Bay. The federal government has been reviewing off-shore vessel routing. In the State Coastal Protection Review, OSPR recommended revision of approaches. Should the HSC be part of the review of approaches. A. Thomas stated that other ports have gone through the process to have IMO include changes in the international scheme. At issue is whether USCG or international law has jurisdiction outside the twelve mile limit. C. Sharpe, USCG, reported that, for the Port Access Routes Study, discussions were held with local users here who were advocates of a single lane approach and those who advocated three approaches. The single lane was favored by representatives of the Center for Marine Conservation and OSPR. The San Francisco Bar Pilots, Council of American Master Mariners and WISPA, an oil group, favored three approaches because this sorts traffic until it merges under VTS eyes at the pilot station. A notice of the study results has been drafted and is currently in legal review. Within weeks it will leave here to go to Washington for final approval and publication. It focuses on port approaches to the marine sanctuary. In 1989 IMO rotated the southern approach, at Santa Barbara, slightly, and adopted an 18 mile extension. The federal claim to authority over vessels at sea is maintained if approaches are involved. C. Sharpe added that the Aids to Navigation Group welcomes input after a decision is published in the Federal Register. Any changes are open to comment. R. Peters indicated that he would like to hear the Center for Marine Conservation's rationale for a single lane approach. C. Sharpe referred to the Center's publication "Safe Passage", which focused on sensitive eco-systems, especially the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. The southern approach points traffic into and through this marine sanctuary. CMC's intent is to move traffic further away from the coastline. B. Leland stated that OSPR did not take a position to advocate a single lane. M. Croce added that tankers use the western approach and a WISPA agreement keeps them 50 miles off the coast, although some vessels don't honor this.

The Chair suggested that all six items on the 9-9-96 memo from J. Lundstrom be agendaed for the October HSC meeting. J. Lundstrom responded that the consensus of the committee seemed to be that item #1 should be taken on by the committee and that the committee would like more information on item #2. (3) *[from the Lundstrom memo]* addresses potential federal budget cuts and discussion at the federal level regarding a public/private partnership in the event federal funding for VTS is withdrawn in the future. What role should the HSC take? D. Soback, VTS, reported that upgrades to the system are in progress. New radar sites at Pt. San Pablo and Mare Island have been operational since mid-June. They

9-12-96

feed on a phone line to displays that are monitored by VTS watch standers. TV cameras at Oxol and Mare Island are also monitored by VTS Center watch standers. There are some software problems and the next adjustment is scheduled for October. The bottom line is that sensors are working and are monitored all the way to the SP Bridge. VTS is not ready to shut off the old system and use the new one exclusively yet – maybe in January or February. Regarding private partnership issues, VTS is fully funded at last year's level plus additional money for FY 97 and full funding is anticipated for FY 98. VTS is "open for business". The PORTS feed is an example of a partnership between users and VTS. If users want something more developed, VTS is ready to talk.

Due to the hour, the Chair agendaed the remaining three issues from the Lundstrom memo for the October HSC meeting. Both the HSC Chair and Vice Chair will be away for that meeting. R. Peters will chair it. A. Thomas noted that the HSC will need to continue to meet monthly at least until the tug escort regulations are ready.

12. NEW BUSINESS: M. Brown reported that BCDC has come up with figures that indicate that container traffic will increase three-fold in the next twenty years. A public roundtable discussion has been scheduled for 9-17-96, from 9:00 to 4:00 at the Metro Center, Oakland. J. Lundstrom added that the subject of the meeting is the Seaport Plan provision to set aside 220 acres at the Alameda Naval Air Station after the base closure for a container transfer facility. Issues to be discussed include competitive aspects, land use planning, Pacific Coast shipping, types of cargo and the big picture in general. Participants will include a broad range of economists, representatives of academia and users.

13. NEXT MEETING. The next meeting will be held at the Port of Oakland on 10-10-96 at 10:00 and will be chaired by R. Peters.

14. MOTION to adjourn by D. Adams, seconded by M. McMillan. Meeting adjourned at 12:25 without objection.

Respectfully submitted,



Terry Hunter
Executive Secretary

POLLUTION STATISTICS
FOR PERIOD 01JUN96 - 30JUN96

	MSO	MSD	TOTAL
1.) Total reported/investigated pollution incidents within MSO SF BAY AOR:	<u>16</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>
Civil Penalty Action	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
Spill, No Source	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
No Spill, Potential Only	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
No Spill, Unconfirmed Report	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
EPA Zone Reports	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
2.) Discharges of Oil from:			
Deep Draft Vessels	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Oil Transfer Facilities	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Military Vessels/Facilities	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
3.) Federalized Cleanups,	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
4.) Non-Federal Cleanups	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
5.) Hazardous Material Releases	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
6.) Cases requiring polreps	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
7.) Tickets Issued	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>

Significant Cases:

VSL SEA SONG owned by James O'Leary - TK00049317 & MC96011314

POLLUTION STATISTICS

FOR PERIOD 01JUL96 - 31JUL96

	MSO	MSD	TOTAL
1.) Total reported/investigated pollution incidents within MSO SF BAY AOR:	<u>27</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>29</u>
Civil Penalty Action	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Spill, No Source	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
No Spill, Potential Only	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
No Spill, Unconfirmed Report	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>
EPA Zone Reports	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
2.) Discharges of Oil from:			
Deep Draft Vessels	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Oil Transfer Facilities	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Military Vessels/Facilities	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
3.) Federalized Cleanups	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
4.) Non-Federal Cleanups	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
5.) Hazardous Material Releases	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
6.) Cases requiring polreps	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
7.) Tickets Issued	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>

Significant Cases:

VSL SEA SONG owned by James O'Leary - TK00049317 & MC96011314

POLLUTION STATISTICS

FOR PERIOD 01AUG96 - 31AUG96

	MSO	MSD	TOTAL
1.) Total reported/investigated pollution incidents within MSO SF BAY AOR:	<u>31</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>36</u>
Civil Penalty Action	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>
Spill, No Source	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Spill, No Action Taken	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
No Spill, Potential Only	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
No Spill, Unconfirmed Report	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
EPA Zone Reports	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
2.) Discharges of Oil from:			
Deep Draft Vessels	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Oil Transfer Facilities	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Military Vessels/Facilities	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
3.) Federalized Cleanups	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
4.) Non-Federal Cleanups	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
5.) Hazardous Material Releases	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
6.) Cases requiring polreps	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
7.) Tickets Issued	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>

Significant Cases:

STATION GOLDEN GATE SPILL - USCG Station Golden Gate's fueling pipeline discharged approximately 1114 gallons of Diesel Fuel into the soil surrounding the piping system. Damage to one of the pipe elbows is suspected as the cause. Product is leaching out of the soil into the bay at a slow rate. Cleanup underway. Case pends.

VSL SEA SONG owned by James O'Leary - Created a potential by ignoring the Captian of the Port Order and ramming Raley's dock in west Sacramento. Case federalized and approximately 1200 gallons of diesel and bilge slops removed from vessel.

DUTRA BARGE - Crane barge sank in the Sacramento River. Approximately 150 to 200 gallons of diesel was released. Crane was removed seperately and barge remains sunk. Approximately 650 gallons of diesel may remain on board.

SIGNIFICANT PORT SAFETY EVENTS

FOR PERIOD 01 JUNE 96 - 31 AUG 96

1. Total Port Safety cases open for period. 45
Cases include:
 - Bridge Casualties (all minor delta bridges)
 - SIV Arrival/Departures
 - Marine Construction
 - Marine Events
 - Explosive Anchorage Activation
2. SOLAS Interventions/COTP Orders 2/2
3. Number of vessels requesting/granted Letters of Deviation to enter Bay10/10
Cases include:
 - 6 Inop Radar
 - 4 Inop Gyro
4. Propulsion/Steering Casualties 5/3
 - All cases involved either faulty pumps, valves, or turbochargers, causing reduced RPMs or intermittent/faulty steering.
5. Deadship tow 1
6. Vessel Fires 0

Significant Cases (chronological):

24 JUN 96: M/V SEALAND RELIANCE (US) - STEERING CASUALTY

On June 24th, the M/V SEALAND RELIANCE reported control problems with their starboard steering gear pump and requested permission to enter port to affix repairs. The vessel was allowed to enter the port with a tug escort and a posted licensed engineer in the steering engine flat. The vessel moored safely at berth on the 25th. The steering pump was repaired on the 26th and cleared for departure. Case Closed

24 JUL 96: M/T ALLIANCE SPIRIT (BAHAMIAN) - PROPULSION CASUALTY

On July 24, the M/T ALLIANCE SPIRIT, enroute to Anacortes from Los Angeles, experienced reduced RPMs and a 5 knots max speed. The vessel requested permission to enter port and affix repair to their turbocharger rotor. The vessel was granted permission to enter but required an extra tug escort. On the 26th the vessel safely entered port, repairs were completed at anchorage on the 28th, and the vessel was cleared for departure. Case Closed

28 JUL 96: EX NAVY VSL WILSON ADRIFT - VANDALISM TO MOORINGS

On July 28, 1996 the former U.S. Navy destroyer WILSON was set adrift in an act of vandalism to her moorings at Pier 80, posing a serious threat to the safety and environment of the Port. Mr. Dwayne Toliver of the tug GUARDSMAN (Crowley Marine Services) and Ms. Jeanie Pinto, master of the tug AMERICAN EAGLE (Oscar Niemith Towing), quickly assessed the situation and voluntarily assisted in retrieving the WILSON. In this cooperative effort the WILSON was quickly and safely returned to the pier. The responsive actions of these individuals are highly commendable and greatly appreciated. The San Francisco Police Department is investigating the cause of vandalism. Case Closed.

13 AUG 96: M/V GLORY HOPE - PROPULSION CASUALTY

On August 13, 1996 the M/V GLORY HOPE, enroute to Anchorage 9 from Pittsburg (Suisun Bay) experienced reduced propulsion due to the #5 cylinder's malfunctioning exhaust valve. After two failed attempts to get underway, both requiring a need to anchor, the vessel was not allowed to transit down river past the Southern Pacific Railroad bridge until final repairs were made. Repairs were also required to be completed to the satisfaction of class. 15 hours later repairs were made to the satisfaction of class and the vessel was cleared for departure. Case Closed.