Minutes
HARBOR SAFETY COMMITTEE
Of the San Francisco Bay Region
9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 8, 1992
Board Room, Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA

1.The meeting was called to order by Chairman, A. Thomas, at 9:30. The following committee members or alternates were in attendance: Dave Adams, Port of Oakland; James Faber, Port of Richmond; Alexander Krygsman, Port of Stockton; Morris Croce, Chevron Shipping; Mike Goebel (alternate for Dwight Koops), Exxon Shipping; Lynn Korwatch (alternate for John Gosling), Matson Navigation; James Macaulay, Harbor Tug and Barge Company; Mary McMillan, Westar Marine Services; Joan Lundstrom, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Ann Nothoff, Margo Brown, National Boating Federation; and federal government representatives, Captain J. MacDonald and CMDR Thomas P. Dolan, U. S. Coast Guard. Also in attendance from OSPR, Roger Dunstan and Bud Leland, and a number of attendees from the general public.

2.T. Hunter noted that a quorum was present.

3.J. Lundstrom made a correction to the minutes of September 10, 1992. Pg. 3, #14, l. 5; herring fishermen were issued 430 permits this year, not 4300. It was moved by A. Krygsman and seconded by J. Faber to approve the minutes as corrected; motion passed.

4.The technical advisory sub-committee of the Tug Escort Sub-Committee met and received considerable information. The meeting, chaired by M. Croce, was held at the pilot office. The Chair thanked each and every member of the committee and of the public for their continued attendance and for their input. The Coast Guard has been very helpful and Captain MacDonald has made sure an individual from his staff has attended all meetings on a regular basis. CMA, through P. Moloney, has been more helpful than he can say.

5.PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE. J. Lundstrom reported in A. Nothoff's absence. The sub-committee is waiting for a response from OSPR before proceeding.

6.TUG ESCORT SUB-COMMITTEE. J. Faber reported in R. Peter's absence. At the workshop held 9-24-92, a technical advisory sub-committee was appointed, with M. Croce as chair. The Tug Escort Sub-Committee has taken big steps forward and will come up with a plan that will be acceptable. The work of the sub-committee is proceeding on schedule. The draft permanent guidelines will be ready for distribution on 10-28-92. A public workshop to discuss the draft guidelines will be held 11-5-92. Permanent guidelines will be ready for distribution 11-30-92, with 12-10-92 the date scheduled for the full committee to review, amend and adopt permanent guidelines. J. Faber thanked P. Moloney for the tremendous amount of help he provided.

7.M. Croce reported on the work of the Technical Advisory Sub-Committee of the Tug Escort Sub-Committee, prefacing his report with the caveat that his remarks are unofficial because he has been unable to report to Tug Escort Sub-Committee Chair, R. Peters. He feels it is appropriate that the sub-sub-committee pass on its findings to the Tug Escort Sub-Committee, who will massage the information and make a formal presentation to the full committee. He further stated that it was not clear to him whether or not the advisory committee had been tasked with making recommendations.

8.The subject of the workshop involved two questions. How many tugs can, or should, be used for what size vessel and what kind, twin, single, tractor, etc. The consensus was that there are five categories of vessels: (1) barges up to 20,000 tons deadweight (larger barges were not addressed); (2) tankers to 20,000 tons; (3) tankers to 60,000 tons;

(4) tankers to 120,000 or 150,000 tons (from a practical standpoint, the advisory committee did not see a significant distinction and left the decision as to cut-off point of this category to the full committee); and (5) over 120,000 or 150,000 deadweight tons. M. Croce added that, personally from a technical standpoint, a cut-off at 60,000 or 80,000 doesn't make a difference if one maintains standards for bollard pull. Most discussion regarded bollard pull. The principal of power to size remained.

9. For up to 120,000 or 150,000 one tug with enough horsepower was regarded as adequate. For 120,000 or 150,000 upward the preferred way was the use of two boats; more in tune with what the work to do in the bay looks like. The pilots in attendance at the workshop, S. Wallace and W. Spry, agreed with these conclusions.

10. On the issue of twin versus single screw, it was agreed that barges could be served by a single screw boat; tankers up to 60,000 deadweight tons using only one boat should use a twin screw; tankers over 60,000 deadweight tons could be served by two single screw or a combination of boats. The maximum tugs in escort is three. The advisory committee confirmed the notion that tugs on standby in zone 2, for work in zone 1, must be capable of zone 1 work, i.e., going outside to render assistance.

11. The advisory committee also looked at the question of what equipment should be on an escort tug: power winches or comparable machinery forward and aft; a main towing winch or comparable device designed to be used primarily in emergency assist situations which must be positioned according to the design of the tug and the type of assistance to be rendered, generally that will place it aft, but propulsion factors could change that; two VHF radios or other equivalent redundancy; and a heaving line throwing apparatus. The group readily agreed that the size and strength of tow lines should equal the bollard pull of the tug and drag hull resistance of the tug times 1.5.

12. Questions not addressed by the advisory committee to date include: (1) if there are three tugs, should two be the same type (balanced); (2) if multiple tugs are used, is the bollard pull required equal to the minimum of one tug or something else; (3) what firefighting equipment/ability should the tug have; (4) should there be redundant radars; and (5) should there be redundancy in steering gear. The advisory committee ran out of time before the issues could be addressed and M. Croce will suggest to R. Peters that the task force should be allowed to meet again to complete review of these items. J. Faber concurred that it would be appropriate to hold another workshop.

13. A. Krygsman asked who was on the Tug Escort Sub-Committee Technical Advisory Committee. A. Thomas responded, D. Koops, R. Nyborg and J. Macaulay. The committee also had a naval architect from Glouston in attendance for his expertise. One problem noted by M. Croce was the fact that the work of the group becomes less technical than it should be because of the public nature of a workshop. J. Faber suggested the committee hold its next workshop as an open forum and then retire into executive session to complete its work. M. Goebel asked when two tugs would be used. A. Krygsman responded that a single tug could be used for tankers up to 120,000 or 150,000 tons deadweight, with the actual cut-off point being determined by the Tug Escort Sub-Committee. Technical information regarding the navigational profile (maneuverability) of certain tankers and what a specific type of tug can do is available. A. Thomas stated that what you can do with a tanker over 120,000 or 130,000 tons deadweight and the characteristics of the ship's handling have only been measured in deep water.

14. R. Dunstan noted that if the advisory committee needs time to work on a highly technical level it has the option of meeting without the workshop format and not accepting testimony from the attending public. A. Thomas responded that the intention has been to keep meetings open to input but if enough information has been gathered the committee can ask to work without taking comment. He added that he needed to leave the workshop early to meet another commitment and would like to clarify his position regarding cut-off points for categorizing vessels. He personally believes that the cut-off point for the fourth category should be 120,000 tons deadweight; above that point a single screw should not substitute for a twin screw; over 150,000 tons deadweight two tugs should be used.

J. Macaulay asked where the cut-off point for the use of two tugs was being set and if both should be twin over 120,000 - 150,000 tons deadweight and single before that. M. Brown and M. Croce agreed.

15. J. Macaulay stated that the workshop also looked at stability requirements, but he is not sure whether it was considered only for zone 1 work or for all escort work. M. Croce responded that tugs on standby for zone 1 work must be able to go outside; further inclusion of other areas could be discussed later. A. Thomas noted that this is an important issue for owners and operators. J. Macaulay added that towline/tow freeboard is a separate issue. A. Thomas stated that, in an emergency maneuver with two tugs rather than one, the tugs should grab each bow and steer/stop. If tugs get off the front they need stability and freeboard. M. Croce added that the statement has been made that performance is what counts. Requirements/regulations should allow freedom for tug escorts to prove themselves beyond the minimum. A. Nothoff stated the opinion that the Harbor Safety Committee should not be ratifying what happens on the bay but establish performance standards for escort work and encourage technical advancements. M. Croce noted that bow thrusters were discussed at the workshop and the consensus was that they are not to be taken into consideration as replacements for tugs.

16.A. Nothoff apologized for being late. She reiterated the information provided by J. Lundstrom regarding the working of the Plan Sub-Committee; they are waiting for a response from OSPR. The sub-committee has moved forward to identify those recommendations where it is not clear who will be responsible for implementation and/or enforcement and has gone back to the sub-committee responsible for generating the recommendation for assistance in making the identifications. OSPR has said that the Plan must identify the responsible party(ies).

17.ENFORCEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE. A. Thomas requested that T. Hunter contact J. Mes when he returns from vacation and ask him for a report on the work of this sub-committee.

18.CAPTAIN OF THE PORT'S REPORT, Captain J. MacDonald. There have been two spills of note since the last meeting. In Eureka a fishing vessel was tied up and left with valves open. The vessel sank spilling 2,000 gallons. The responsible party took complete responsibility and acted to clean up the spill. There was good cooperation between the Coast Guard and OSPR. Jack Alderson, Pacific Affiliates, provided an oily water separator and the skimming pump collected 1,200 gallons of pure product. Divers plugged the leak and the vessel was raised. There was very little sheen out of the immediate area and no trucks were needed. A. Nothoff stated that she has been told that this is the second time this particular boat has sunk and asked what the mechanics of possible disciplinary action are. M. MacDonald responded that the event is under investigation. The spill was the result of operator error; someone failed to close the valve to a live bait tank. He asked how you can legislate against oversight. The owner did act responsibly. There will be a civil penalty for the spilled oil and for the approximately $40,000 damage done to the pier when the vessel rolled over. There was not a lot of expense involved in the clean-up effort because of the successful use of Alderson's equipment.

19.The second spill occurred at Loch Lommond Marine as the result of a boat fire. Occupants were trying to jump start the engine with the use of several extra batteries. The boat burned to the water line and there was significant sheen. The responsible party did not take action and the clean-up response was $10,000. It is recommended that sorbents be held at each harbor to hold and contain spilled materials; they work very well for lighter fuels like gasolines, etc.

20. A major spill drill scheduled for San Diego on 12-4-92 is in the planning stages. It will be moderated by the National Strike Force and will be on the magnitude of the one held here last year. It seems to be taking a long time to organize the Port Area Committees, but a lot has been happening. The membership of the sub-committees has been decided; goals and objectives have been drafted and the work is not beginning at square one.

21.M. Steinhilber reported that four meetings have been held in the last six weeks with P. Dolan regarding seasonal herring fishing operations. Fish and Game and the Coast Guard are better coordinated to effect enforcement. The Coast Guard has made floating platforms available. The VTS information regarding vessel arrivals to the bay on channel 13 doesn't get to fishermen. This information is transmitted for fishermen on channel 22 or can be obtained by cellular telephone where 24 hour access to vessel arrival and sailing information is available. At a meeting of 10-5-92 representatives of the ports and the fishermen agreed to identify heavily trafficked areas where fishing is to be prohibited with yellow placards. Maps of the active piers will also be included with herring fishing permits; including the Sausalito Ferry docks and the Pier 9 pilot station. Currently this regulation of fishing in particular areas is on a voluntary basis. Next year it will be codified on the state and federal level. There are efforts underway to get the Navy to open Hunters' Point to the fishermen. A. Thomas asked that a copy of the hand-out described by forwarded to this committee.

22.VTS upgrade is scheduled for completion in April, 1994. The project is on track with the funding bill being passed earlier this week. M. Brown asked if the buoys at the Sausalito Ferry pier are temporary. P. Dolan responded yes and they have been logged in "Notice to Mariners". M. Steinhilber stated that preparations are underway for the first meeting for area contingency response planning. Meetings have been held between the Coast Guard and representatives of each of the three areas. Plans are being formed by representatives of the Coast Guard, OSPR, local Fish and Game wardens and a biologist. Their brainstorming resulted in a good list of natural working groups and an appropriate response network. A polished presentation will be ready in late October or early November. The northern California coast includes Humbolt Bay and San Francisco Bay and delta. The central coast includes Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo. The definition of Monterey Bay Sanctuary will require extra work. J. Faber asked M. Steinhilber about the Coast Guard working with consultants in Pt. Heuneme to teach tug operators and fishermen firefighting skills; they expect to use vessels of opportunity in an emergency. Steve Ricks, Clean Bay, stated that this type of educational program is underway. A. Nothoff asked about such a program for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary and about tanker regulations in the designated area. M. Steinhilber responded that the area committees will address response to a major spill; prevention is the vehicle of the Harbor Safety Committee. The Monterey Bay area does not have the same vehicle within the established sanctuary. The Coast Guard is working with them outside the area committees; NOAA will be the coordinator.

23. Chief Attaway reported that the Coast Guard became aware in August that NOAA had no plans to resurvey the bay. A meeting was scheduled and a strong presentation was made for up-to-date surveys. It was requested that a detailed proposal be prepared by the Coast Guard and that was done with the help of the San Francisco Bar Pilots and J. Lundstrom. As a result, NOAA is retaining the Pacific Survey Team in the area and they will begin to resurvey the bay in January, 1993. There are several detailed changes needed to charts 18643 and 18649 and more soundings are needed to define the shoal east of Alcatraz. There is a small craft warning (precautionary area) because larger vessels are turning to join traffic lanes; soundings north of buoy C will establish a 36' contour line to define the shoaling. This project will only be on-going if there is significant public input. The number to call is 510-437-3098. J. Macaulay asked if the Coast Guard is surveying navigational aids. J. MacDonald responded that the survey is in process, with two more sections to complete. A. Krygsman asked if the up river areas are included. J. MacDonald answered that they have only been tasked to do the central bay; some facets have gone beyond that area, but not as far as up to Sacramento or Stockton as he would like. It is required but hasn't been done yet. A NOAA workshop is being held in Washington, D. C., on 10-21-92 and C. Bowler will attend to reiterate the importance of PORTS surveys.

24.J. MacDonald stated that the Coast Guard is working with the Navy during Fleet Week and he would appreciate feedback on how things go. Every year the parade gets bigger and more recreational boats attend. The Navy ship the ABRAHAM LINCOLN will lead the parade and it is a very deep draft vessel that can only go under the bridge in one place and must stay in the channel. He would like to see a smaller lead ship. While the Blue Angels perform, the square under them must be kept clear. Feedback from M. Brown would be appreciated. The power speedboat race was held on a significantly shortened course so it would not interfere with the ferries and feedback on how this worked would also be helpful. Fireboat spray will be used around submarines during Fleet Week to keep curious recreational boaters clear.

25.R. Dunstan reported that the OSPR review of the Harbor Safety Plan is not yet completed, but should be very soon. Given the complexity of the plan, there are very few comments, due mostly to the considerable work and public comment that went into it. OSPR won't proceed unless their language is acceptable to this committee. The tug escort regulations will be mailed to members of the Harbor Safety Committee within a week or two. There may be some disagreement on a couple of issues, like the exemption of double hull vessels from tug escort requirements. The regulations for contingency plans will be complete by 11-1-92. Vessel operators will receive a simplified document which will say "the regs say this . . ."; matter-of-fact compliance guidelines. D. Adams asked for a definition of marine terminal, it sounds like it includes any waterfront facility with a storm drain. R. Dunstan responded that the definition is fairly broad as required by SB 2040 to include any facility where a spill could impact marine waters. There has been an attempt to get specific after the Avila Beach spill. The spill wasn't generated by a facility on marine waters but it came from one uphill from the water and that is what is trying to be clarified. D. Adams stated he thought a terminal was involved with oil. R. Dunstan answered that the term facility is broader than terminal and means any facility used to transfer product. A terminal with a barge does not need a contingency plan, but a tanker with a barge does. J. Faber noted that in the case of a diesel fuel truck, the operator must comply. A. Thomas added that it was not the intent of OSPR to include dry cargo facilities. R. Dunstan answered that in 99% of cases that is true, when in doubt - call.

26.J. Macaulay asked if OSPR has redrafted the tug escort guidelines. R. Dunstan responded yes, into regulatory formal. J. Macaulay asked where we are then. R. Dunstan answered that when OSPR and the committee agree on language, then we will go to public hearing, respond to public comment and then adopt the regulations. J. Faber suggested it might be wiser to go to the Tug Escort Sub-Committee first. A. Thomas stated that the process is to go to the full committee first and then to the sub-committee. A. Nothoff noted that the interim and permanent guidelines will intersect and that will help OSPR with policy issues. J. Faber stated that the sub-committee dumped the exemption for double hull tankers based on J. MacDonald's opinion. M. Goebel asked for an update from OSPR on the voluntary escort concept. R. Dunstan responded that the Administrator is waiting and will be in a position to address the issue within a month. M. Croce stated that the reason given to eliminate double hull tankers because OPA 90 will. He is not willing to agree.

27.UNFINISHED BUSINESS. None.

28.NEW BUSINESS. D. Adams' alternate, Andrew Clarke-Clough has left and his new alternate is Jon Amdur, a marine biologist with the Port of Oakland's Environmental Department.

29.A. Nothoff asked about the work of the Pilotage Sub-Committee and the OSPR pilotage study. A. Thomas responded that A. Krygsman would schedule a meeting to be held soon. B. Leland answered that the Administrator's study is just about ready and should be complete within a week and will go out for comment. It is a status report of what exists and invites comments that will go beyond the description to recommendations. J. Lundstrom asked if all committee members will get a copy. T. Hunter stated that the Marine Exchange will distribute the report to all members. A. Nothoff asked if any Harbor Safety Committee other than Los Angeles is looking at pilotage. B. Leland responded that all five are, with varying degrees of interest and intensity; it is a requirement of SB 2040.

30.M. Goebel thanked Leo Brien, PMSA, and his group for all the work they did to reinstate the bunker tax exemption. It will represent the return of additional bunkering activity to the area in 1993. Those bunkering companies will be assisted by the work of the Harbor Safety Committee and contingency plans.

21.The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 11-12-92, in the Port of San Francisco Commissioners' Room at 9:30 a.m.

25.MOTION by J. Lundstrom, seconded by A. Krygsman to adjourn the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Hunter
Executive Secretary