

AD-A033 108

COAST GUARD WASHINGTON D C OFFICE OF MERCHANT MARINE--ETC F/6 13/12
ACTIVITIES RELATING TO TITLE II PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY ACT --ETC(U)
JAN 76 R BENNETT
USCG-M-4-77

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1 of 1
AD A033108



ADA 033108

1. Report No. 14 USCG-M-4-77 ✓	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No. 11	
4. Title and Subtitle 6 Activities Relating to Title II Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972		5. Report Date Jan 1976	6. Performing Organization Code G-MP-2/82
7. Author(s) 10 Robert Bennett	8. Performing Organization Report No. Same as #1		10. Work Unit No. (TRAVIS)
9. Performing Organization Name and Address U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters Office of Merchant Marine Safety Washington, D. C. 20590		11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address	12 43p.	13. Type of Report and Period Covered 9 Final Report, 1975-1976	
15. Supplementary Notes Section 203 of the Act requires that the Secretary, for a period of ten years following the enactment of Title II, make a report to Congress. This is the 4th of 10 such reports.			
16. Abstract It has not been possible for the Coast Guard to develop rules comprehensively covering all of the problems in the time period since the Ports and Waterways Safety Act became law. The rules for tank vessels in domestic trade, constituting a first step toward the body of rules and regulations that will ultimately be required to fully implement the Act, concentrate primarily on the standards to reduce damage to the marine environment by normal vessel operations such as ballasting, cargo handling and other activities, and also contain some significant measures affecting the standards to reduce cargo loss following collision, grounding or other accident. The problem of reducing the risk of collisions, groundings, or other accidents to tank vessels in our ports, waterways, and coastal waters is a more complex problem than either the Coast Guard or the Congress anticipated when the Ports and Waterways safety Act of 1972 was enacted. Like many other complex problems the number of factors involved and their interrelationships make human intuition a poor tool for determining what solutions are appropriate. The Coast Guard is attempting to collect the necessary knowledge as rapidly as our abilities and resources will permit; at the same time we are proceeding with regulations and other corrective measures which are appropriate and justifiable.			
17. Key Words Rules for tank vessels Standards Risk Reduction Corrective Measures		18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	20. Security Classif. (of this page) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 54	22. Price

406934

Handwritten initials

NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U. S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

A REPORT TO CONGRESS

**ACTIVITIES
RELATING TO
TITLE II
PORTS AND WATERWAYS
SAFETY ACT OF 1972**



DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 3 1976
C



JANUARY 1976

ACCESSION FOR	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
JOC	Blue Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	<i>for 1973 ACTA</i>
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	APPL. NO. OF DIST.
A	

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD**

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
REPORT TO CONGRESS	5
Part A - A description of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.	5
Section i - To improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability and otherwise reduce the risks of collision, grounding and other accidents.	5
Section ii - To reduce cargo loss in the event of collision, grounding and other accidents.	13
Section iii - To reduce damage to the marine environment from the normal operation of the vessels to which Title II applies.	15
Part B - The progress made with respect to adoption of international standards for the design, construction, alteration and repair of vessels to which this title applies for protection of the marine environment.	17
Part C - To the extent that the Secretary finds standards with respect to the design, construction, alteration and repair of vessels for the purpose set forth in Part A, Sections i, ii, or iii not possible, an explanation of the reasons therefor.	23
Part D - Other Coast Guard activities related to the Act.	27
LIST OF REFERENCES	31
Appendix I - Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade, Protection of Marine Environment (40 FR 48280-48290)	
APPENDIX II - Maneuvering Characteristics (40 FR 2689-2690)	
APPENDIX III - Vessel Inspection Regulations, Proposed Rulemaking (40 FR 42751-42754)	

INTRODUCTION

Title II of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, which amended the Tank Vessel Act (46 U.S.C. 391a), states in Section 201(7) (A):

"The Secretary shall begin publication as soon as practicable of proposed rules and regulations setting forth minimum standards of design, construction, alteration, and repair of the vessels to which this section applies for the purpose of protecting the marine environment. Such rules and regulations shall, to the extent possible, include but not be limited to standards to improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability and otherwise reduce the possibility of collision, grounding, or other accident, to reduce cargo loss following collision, grounding, or other accident, and to reduce damage to the marine environment by normal vessel operations such as ballasting and deballasting, cargo handling, and other activities."

Section 203 of the Act requires an annual report to Congress. Section 203 states:

"Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall, for a period of ten years following the enactment of this title, make a report to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session, regarding his activities under this title. Such report shall include but not be limited to (A) a description of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary (i) to improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability and otherwise reduce the risks of collisions, groundings, and other accidents, (ii) to reduce cargo loss in the event of collision, groundings, and other accidents, and (iii) to reduce damage

to the marine environment from the normal operation of the vessels to which this title applies, (B) the progress made with respect to the adoption of international standards for the design, construction, alteration, and repair of vessels to which this title applies for protection of the marine environment, and (C) to the extent that the Secretary finds standards with respect to the design, construction, alteration, and repair of vessels for the purposes set forth in (A)(i), (ii), or (iii) above not possible, an explanation of the reasons therefor."

This is the fourth report being submitted pursuant to Section 203 of the Act.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Congress, by means of Title II of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, directed that rules be developed in three areas:

1. Standards to improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability and otherwise reduce the possibility of collision, grounding or other accident.
2. Standards to reduce cargo loss following collision, grounding or other accident.
3. Standards to reduce damage to the marine environment by normal vessel operations such as ballasting and deballasting, cargo handling and other activities.

It has not been possible for the Coast Guard to develop rules comprehensively covering all of the problems in the time period since the Ports and Waterways Safety Act became law. The rules for tank vessels in domestic trade, constituting a first step toward the body of rules and regulations that will ultimately be required to fully implement the Act, concentrate primarily on the third area listed above and also contain some significant measures affecting the second area. There are two reasons for this emphasis: operational pollution accounts for 80 percent of the oil inputs to the oceans from tankers, and international standards which will greatly reduce operational pollution, as well as contribute significantly to the reduction of accidental oil outflows, have been elaborated and proposed for worldwide adoption in the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships.

The problem of reducing the risk of collisions, groundings, or other accidents to tank vessels in our ports, waterways, and coastal waters is a

more complex problem than either the Coast Guard or the Congress anticipated when the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 was enacted. Like many other complex problems the number of factors involved and their interrelationships make human intuition a poor tool for determining what solutions are appropriate. The Coast Guard is attempting to collect the necessary knowledge as rapidly as our abilities and resources will permit; at the same time we are proceeding with regulations and other corrective measures which are appropriate and justifiable. Moreover, we are beginning to realize the results of our efforts to develop a management information system responsive to our mandate in Title II as well as an improvement in the casualty investigation - casualty analysis role in pinpointing the failures in the human-vessel design/maintenance error areas.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

A. Description of the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

i. Rules to improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability and otherwise reduce the risks of collisions, groundings, and other accidents.

Prior to reviewing Coast Guard efforts to fulfill the mandate of this requirement of the Act, it is appropriate to ask, "What was envisioned at the time the requirement was written?"

It is apparent from the wording used in the Act and in the Senate Report on the Act (reference 1) that the drafters envisioned that the Coast Guard would issue regulations requiring certain design and equipment changes to tank vessels which would improve their maneuvering and stopping ability and thus reduce accidents. Minimum standards for required maneuvering and stopping ability would also be set by the Coast Guard.

For example, the Senate Report states the committee's hearing indicated "that tremendous increases in sizes of tankers have substantially reduced the ability of these vessels to maneuver, thus avoiding collisions, groundings and other accidents." ^{1/} The report concludes "much more needs to be done" in the area of improving maneuverability of tankers and discusses a recommendation that lateral thrusters be required to provide side force to assist in docking and maneuvering.^{2/} The report states:

^{1/} Senate Report, page 18.

^{2/} Senate Report, page 19.

"Standards in this category might include minimum propulsion and particularly reverse propulsion requirements, bow thrusters or lateral thrusters, water resistance flaps, or standards might be stated in terms of performance requirements for maneuverability, crash stop ability and directional control ability." ^{3/}

Assumptions implicit in the Act

There are several key assumptions implicit in this view of the problem:

- . The lack of improved stopping and maneuvering ability was resulting in tanker accidents.
- . Equipment and design changes could be made which would significantly improve the maneuvering and stopping ability of large tankers.
- . Minimum standards for the required maneuvering and stopping ability could be set in a fashion so tankers would be required to achieve some minimum standard which would reduce accident risks to an acceptable level.
- . Improved maneuvering and stopping ability would result in fewer accidents.
- . Fewer accidents would mean less pollution and less damage to the marine environment.

^{3/} Senate Report, page 28.

The Coast Guard participated in the hearings leading to passage of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act and provided information on problems associated with the tanker oil pollution problem. Lacking sufficient data in a form to contest (or verify) the assumptions outlined above, the Coast Guard did not challenge their validity nor the inference that standards for improved maneuvering and stopping ability were feasible and needed. The Coast Guard believed that such standards could possibly be effective in contributing both to safety and the protection of the marine environment, and that regulations that were practicable in terms of cost and technical feasibility could be developed.

Upon further reflection, it appears that these assumptions are incorrect in several respects. It is important to carefully examine several of the assumptions implicit in the Ports and Waterways Safety Act's mandate regarding improved maneuvering and stopping ability.

Assumption: The lack of improved stopping and maneuvering ability results in tanker accidents, and the corollary, improved maneuvering and stopping ability would result in fewer accidents.

Discussion: Results of all the casualty analysis work carried out by the Coast Guard and others to date fail to support this assumption.

One indication of a need to improve large tank vessel maneuverability would be if accident data indicated that large tankers were experiencing collision, ramming and grounding accidents at a rate greater than smaller vessels. Intuitive feeling is that large tankers might perhaps have a higher accident rate. However, this intuitive feeling is not supported by accident information. Worldwide accident figures (reference 4) indicate

that during the period 1969-1973, tankers over 150,000 DWT were involved in collisions, rammings, and groundings at the rate of 0.0465 involvements per ship year. (This means that based on the past five years of accident data, one could expect 4.65 percent of those tankers greater than 150,000 DWT to have a collision, a ramming, or a grounding each year.) The average frequency for all tankers greater than 3,000 DWT is 0.0958. The group of tankers having the highest frequency of accidents are those in the 20,000-40,000 DWT range where their frequency is 0.1265.

Another indication of a need to improve large tank vessels' maneuverability would be the determination that inadequate maneuverability was a major contributing factor in these accidents. To examine for this, Coast Guard casualty information for years 1972 through 1974, worldwide, was sorted by the recorded cause of the accident. These results showed that there were 1206 vessels greater than 10,000 gross tons involved in collision, ramming, and grounding accidents. Of these 1206, only 80 accidents (or 6.6 percent) could be attributed to inadequate vessel maneuverability, and most of these were the result of a breakdown of the installed propulsion and maneuvering system. In addition to sorting all casualties by cause, individual accident records have been reviewed to see if the maneuvering design of the ships involved was inadequate. Results of the sorting by cause and individual accident investigations show that more than 65 percent of the accidents were caused in whole, or in part, by "inadequate human performance." Only 6 percent were attributed to inadequate vessel maneuvering capabilities. These percentages do not change appreciably with vessel size.

Thus none of the casualty analyses conducted to date demonstrate a definite, pressing need for improved maneuverability of large tankships.

Assumption: Equipment and design changes can be made which will significantly improve the maneuvering and stopping ability of large tankers.

Discussion: The turning, course changing, and course keeping of tankers are generally considered to be satisfactory (except, perhaps, for low speed turning ability). All of the measures commonly suggested are intended to improve stopping or low speed turning ability. Because of the physics of the situation, however, none of the possible design or equipment features can be expected to improve the stopping ability of large tankships by more than 30 percent. The fact is that, because of their mass and the braking forces available, large tankers cannot be made to maneuver as readily as smaller ships. Specific features and the improvements they make possible are discussed in reference 2, U.S. Coast Guard, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Regulations for Tank Vessels Engaged in the Carriage of Oil in Domestic Trade; Protection of the Marine Environment, 15 August 1975, (pages 63-71).

Assumption: Minimum standards for required maneuvering and stopping ability can be set by the Coast Guard so tankers are forced to perform to some minimum standard which will reduce accident risks to an acceptable level.

Discussion: Two questions arise in carrying out these instructions:

What is "acceptable risk" and how does one define it, and what is the relationship between tanker maneuverability and risk of collision or grounding?

Various efforts are underway, both within the Coast Guard Commercial Vessel Safety R&D Program and elsewhere, to gain better understanding and methods of dealing with public risk resulting from various activities (nuclear power plants, transportation of hazardous chemicals, utilization of SST aircraft, and application of other technologies). But this is still a developing field and evaluations are still largely subjective - "Is the risk of (such and such) tolerable?" Reaching a consensus of the parties being subjected to the risk is a significant problem when many people are concerned and the process of assessing the risk is complex.

A second problem is that of determining how tanker maneuverability affects risk of collision or grounding. It is clear that maneuverability is only one facet of the larger question of controllability and maneuverability standards must be viewed in that context. It is apparent then that minimum maneuverability design standards necessary to insure safe navigation will vary for the same ship from port to port and even within the same port area during varying weather and tidal conditions. What the Coast Guard must be able to do is: (1) identify those parameters of vessel movement which accurately measure its total controllability; (2) evaluate those parameters against the acceptable level of risk for that particular harbor or waterway and weather conditions; and then (3) determine if additional precautions, such as tugs, should be required. In using such an approach, the Coast Guard will consider offering the prospective ship owner incentives to incorporate those individual added design features which he feels are to his economic advantage, while at

the same time allowing him flexibility in evaluating the economic trade-off of vessel design. For example, if when transiting a particular bridge under certain wind and current conditions, a tanker equipped with the conventional maneuvering systems, is by a Coast Guard regulation required to wait at anchor and thus delay its arrival, or alternatively hire tugs, and if the same tanker would have been allowed to transit the bridge had she been equipped with thrusters, the lost revenue accruing from the delay and increased ship, operating, and crew expenses, and possibly tug costs, may cause the tanker owner to install thrusters on similar designs in order to achieve an economic benefit. Another beneficial feature of this incentive approach is that it can be applied to existing vessels, both foreign and domestic.

The importance the Coast Guard places on this broader view of vessel controllability and the role vessel maneuverability, the environment, geographic location, and the human element play in it were discussed at some length in last year's report to Congress. ^{4/}

The assumptions also indicate a lack of appreciation of the importance of the human aspects of the problem. There is no mention in the Act, for example, of the role training or improved personnel qualifications or improved watchstanding procedures might play in reducing accidents. The concentration is primarily on equipment or ship design solutions. Although there was much discussion in the Senate Report and elsewhere about a

^{4/} U.S. Coast Guard, "A Report to Congress, Activities Relating to Title II Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972," January 1975, page 3-4 and 32-34.

"systems approach," it was a limited "system," involving only improvement of vessel traffic control and the vessels themselves. (See pages 13 and 14 of the Senate Report.)

It is now evident that factors in all the following categories must be considered:

Human	Cargo
Equipment	Pathway
Environmental	

The problem of collisions, ramming, and groundings cannot be effectively solved by concentrating on only one of these areas. We must understand as many of the factors as we can and the interrelationships between them.

Using this systematic approach, the Coast Guard has issued regulations aimed at reducing collisions and groundings (1) where it was apparent regulations were needed, (2) where it appeared that such regulations would be effective in reducing accidents, and (3) where the remedial measures were considered practicable in terms of cost and technical feasibility.

Final regulations requiring information on the individual maneuvering and stopping characteristics of ships over 1,600 gross tons (not just tankships) be posted in the vessel's pilothouse were published in the January 15, 1975, Federal Register (40 FR 2689-2690). An area of inquiry concerning efforts to improve human performance in piloting large tankers concerns the information that a vessel's pilot or master needs to have to safely direct a vessel's movements. This rulemaking represents one step in improving the information available.

A notice of proposed rulemaking requiring U.S. vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean and coastwise service to be fitted with radar, radio

direction finder, gyro compass and echo sounding equipment was published in the September 16, 1975, Federal Register (40 FR 42751-54). These rules also specify conditions of vessel operation while under control of an automatic pilot and establish requirements for adequate and up-to-date charts, sailing directions, lists of lights, notices to mariners, tide time tables, and other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

One thing apparent from a review of accident reports is that insuring adequate performance is most important in avoiding tanker accidents. While much remains to be learned about why humans sometimes fail to perform adequately and about the interrelationships between man and the other system components, the Coast Guard has concluded that it is important to act now on what has been learned in an attempt to bring about improved human performance. An advance notice of proposed rulemaking entitled "Marine Traffic Requirements" was therefore published (along with the proposed regulations for tank vessels in domestic trade) on June 28, 1974. The notice indicated that the Coast Guard was considering requirements for improved operating practices and mandatory navigation equipment, and solicited comment from the public. Requirements for some of the items in the June 28, 1974, advance notice are contained in the September 16, 1975, notice of proposed rulemaking described above. Further improvement in safe vessel navigation is specifically being sought in the forthcoming promulgation by the Coast Guard of proposed regulations addressing additional equipment requirements, crew performance standards, and important aspects of vessel operation. The concept of restricting or controlling vessel traffic locally by the Coast Guard Captain of the Port during periods of limited visibility, for example, will be further developed. Additionally, it is intended that the Captains of the Port, under broadly defined ground rules, will require the presence

of towboat assistance to particular vessels in areas of hazardous navigational conditions. An important aspect of these requirements will be their applicability to both U.S. and foreign flag vessels. Ongoing and future efforts toward understanding and reducing factors contributing to accidents are discussed in Part B of this Report.

ii. To reduce cargo loss in the event of collision, grounding, and other accidents.

On October 14, 1975, the Coast Guard published rules and regulations for the protection of the marine environment; Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade (40 FR 48280-48287). These rules are contained in Appendix I of this Report.

Section 157.19 - Cargo tank arrangement and size and Section 157.21 - Subdivision and stability are intended to reduce cargo loss in the event of accidents. The purpose of Section 157.19 is to reduce the outflow of oil from damaged tanks by limiting the size of the tanks and from damaged piping by making requirements of piping arrangement. The purpose of Section 157.21 is to reduce the loss of cargo by reducing the probability of total vessel loss from a collision or grounding accident. This is accomplished by assuring that the vessel has sufficient reserve buoyancy and stability to survive the severe side and bottom damage which may be expected to occur during collision or grounding accidents.

On October 14, 1975, the Coast Guard published proposed rulemaking (40 FR 48289-48290) concerning a standard for the distribution of the segregated ballast tankage which is required by 33 CFR 157.09. This proposed rulemaking is contained in Appendix I of this Report. The purpose of the proposed standard is to distribute the segregated ballast tanks adjacent to the sides and bottom of the vessel in order to provide a degree

of protection against loss of cargo due to collision or grounding accidents and still give the designer flexibility in optimizing the vessel design.

There are a large number of variables involved in designing a complex mechanism like a tank vessel. The designer in making decisions among conflicting variables is forced to seek an optimum rather than a maximum value for each variable. The distribution of segregated ballast cannot be dictated solely by environmental protection considerations. Longitudinal strength, damaged stability, safety with respect to fire and explosions, personnel safety and fostering of sound operating practice, as well as the mitigation of oil outflow must also be taken into account.

The standard as proposed does require that the segregated ballast tanks be adjacent to the sides and bottom and has a distribution formula which accepts any one of the following tank arrangements:

1. Double bottom.
2. Double side.
3. "L" shaped wing tanks.
4. "J" shaped wing tanks.
5. Double hull.
6. Staggered wing tanks combined with reduced volume of intervening cargo tanks.

Comments on the proposed rulemaking are still being received and evaluated. Final rulemaking is scheduled for early 1976.

iii. To reduce damage to the marine environment from normal operation of vessels to which Title II applies.

On October 14, 1975, the Coast Guard published rules and regulations for the protection of the marine environment, Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade (40 FR 48280-48287). These rules are contained in Appendix I

of this Report. All of these rules with the exception of Sections 157.19 and 157.21 are intended to reduce the damage to the marine environment from normal operations of the vessels. Section 157.09 requires new vessels of 70,000 DWT or more to have segregated ballast tanks with sufficient capacity that in normal operations ballast water need not be carried in cargo tanks. Sections 157.11, 157.13, 157.15 and 157.17 require on specified vessels special tanks and piping systems for handling of dirty ballast and tank washings. Subpart C prescribes regulations for the discharge of clean ballast, segregated ballast and oil mixtures and the carriage of ballast water by specified vessels.

B. Progress made with respect to adoption of international standards for design, construction, alteration and repair of tank vessels for protection of the marine environment.

The Coast Guard is in the process of preparing the Environmental Impact Statement and the proposed rules for U.S. tankers carrying oil in foreign trade and foreign tankers carrying oil entering U.S. waters. The rules and regulations for these vessels will be the same as those published for tank vessels in domestic trade except in those operational areas where the United States lacks jurisdiction over foreign vessels. The need for additional construction requirements for inland tank barges is being analyzed and an Environmental Impact Statement and proposed rules are being drafted.

Specifications for oil water separators, oil content monitors and oil interface detectors are being developed.

The Coast Guard encourages ratification of the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (hereinafter 1973 Ship Pollution Convention) by the United States and will work to bring the Convention into force internationally. To date, only two countries have ratified the Convention, Jordan and Kenya. The Coast Guard will continue to participate in meetings of the Marine Environmental Protection Committee of IMCO working toward international solutions to marine pollution problems. Some subjects which the U.S. delegation plans to have addressed in the next session of the Committee are:

1. Segregated ballast on existing tankers.
2. Provisions for reception facilities.
3. Oil water separator and oil discharge control and monitoring equipment.

4. Improved methods of enforcement of convention requirements.
5. Sewage treatment plants for ships.
6. Consideration of the procedures for control of substandard vessels.

Proposed rules and the Environmental Impact Statement for ships other than tankers which carry small amounts of bulk liquid cargo are to be developed.

Proposed rules and the Environmental Impact Statement to implement the 1973 Ship Pollution Convention for ships other than tankers will be developed. The rules will apply to the discharge of oily ballast and bilge water at sea.

The Coast Guard will work internationally as well as with other Federal Agencies and appropriate facets of the marine industry to see that required reception facilities are available to reduce oily bilge and product tanker discharges to the sea.

Recognizing that U.S. waters must be protected from foreign vessels as well as from domestic vessels, the Coast Guard has explored a number of standards requiring various construction features and equipment intended to improve vessel maneuvering and stopping ability. These were previously discussed in Part A, Section i of this Report and are listed below:

- a. Increased astern horsepower (greater backing power).
- b. Twin screws and twin rudders.
- c. Controllable pitch propeller(s)
vertical axis propellers.
- d. Bow thruster, or bow and stern thrusters.
- e. More rudder area.

- f. Faster rudder turning rate.
- g. Flapped rudder.
- h. Rotating cylinder rudder.
- i. Auxiliary braking devices (flaps, parachutes, etc.).
- j. Stern anchors.

The Coast Guard has not at this point taken action to require such construction features and equipment on tank vessels. It has not been possible to show that such features and equipment or the relatively small improvements in maneuvering and stopping ability that they offer would contribute to safety or protection of the marine environment. Specific features and equipment are discussed further in reference 2, (Coast Guard Environmental Impact Statement, pages 63-71).

The Coast Guard has thus far not taken action to set minimum performance requirements for maneuverability, crash stop ability, and directional controllability. The Coast Guard has not yet been able to arrive at a rational basis for setting such minimum performance criteria or establishing the relationship between the various factors involved in determining required maneuverability (such factors as wind, current, channel width, depth and configuration, ship size, ship speed, visibility, traffic, and other factors).

Although the Coast Guard has not yet been able to issue regulations to improve maneuvering and stopping ability, some positive steps toward understanding and reducing factors contributing to accidents have been taken. A systems analysis of the foregoing factors and their effects on vessel maneuverability is presently underway with the objective of establishing, where possible, minimum criteria for safe passage of vessels for the guidance of Captains of the Ports and those responsible for channel and harbor improvements. Aspects of this area are further discussed on page 13, Part A, section i, of this Report.

The Coast Guard believes that efforts to set improved international standards for training and watchkeeping can also reduce the possibility of collisions, groundings, and other accidents. In early 1970, an IMCO working group reported:

"... that in view of the continuing alarming rise in maritime casualties and pollution, it is necessary for urgent action to be taken aimed at strengthening and improving standards of training and professional qualifications of mariners as a means of securing better guarantees of safety at sea and protection of the marine environment."

Since 1971 the IMCO Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping has been working with U.S. participation to prepare documents dealing with personnel standards and qualifications which can form the basis for an international conference on the subject, tentatively scheduled for 1977. Most of the world's merchant fleet sails under foreign flags. This means the United States does not have direct control over standards for crew training and watchkeeping on these ships. It is most important, therefore, that the problems of improving training and professional qualifications, particularly on foreign vessels where standards may not be as high as on U.S. ships, be approached on an international basis through IMCO.

The Coast Guard, through its Office of Research and Development, is conducting investigations in a number of areas in support of efforts to implement Title II of the Act. These areas having international standards implications include:

. A project being conducted by Dr. H. Eda at Stevens Institute of Technology to develop a mathematical vessel movement simulation model

which can be used to study the effects on a vessel's path of changes to various ship, waterway, and situation parameters.

. A project just begun on the role of bridge personnel factors in collisions and groundings and will provide the Coast Guard with better insight into the accident factors now labeled simply "human error."

. Projects now underway involving detailed analysis of casualty reports of ramming and groundings of vessels in harbor and coastal waters and collisions of river tows with bridges will provide required insight into factors leading up to such incidents. These insights coupled with projects to learn more about the piloting practices currently in use in harbors, coastal waters and on the inland waterway system will provide a better understanding of factors and circumstances which lead to accidents.

. A project on the reliability of steering systems just completed will provide information for determining the need for improvements in steering systems and a means of evaluating system reliability.

. A project to develop a means of evaluating the resistance of a vessel's structure to collision and grounding damage recently completed is one step toward the goal of being able to assess the risk of oil outflow under given conditions. The Coast Guard is working with a panel of the National Academy of Sciences in an attempt to evaluate and tie together the research work that has been done on collision and stranding damage resistance for nuclear ships, chemical carriers and other applications in an attempt to assess the current state of the art.

. A project on collision scenario modeling which is almost complete will provide information on the effectiveness of regulations requiring bridge-to-bridge radio in preventing collisions, a better

analysis of some of the causal factors leading to collisions, and an estimate of the effectiveness of a requirement that vessels be equipped with devices to appraise relative motion of radar targets.

This research is necessary if effective realistic corrective measures are to be developed and instituted.

C. To the extent that the Secretary finds standards with respect to the design, construction, alteration and repair of vessels for the purpose set forth in Ai, ii, or iii above not possible, an explanation of the reasons therefor.

There have been, and there continue to be, proposals and arguments presented to require double bottoms for tank vessels. The concept of distributing segregated ballast spaces as defensive space, double bottoms being a particular arrangement of these spaces, has been under discussion nationally and internationally since at least 1971.

The Coast Guard in the January 26, 1973, advance notice of proposed rulemaking (38 FR 2467) requested comments on the concept of placing segregated ballast in double bottom tanks. Later, in October 1973, the International Conference on Marine Pollution, 1973, was unable to agree upon double bottoms as the required arrangement of segregated ballast. In fact, no rules for the distribution were specified in the resulting International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973.

The U.S. position fostering double bottoms (originated by the Coast Guard) was founded on two years (1969 and 1970) of worldwide spill data which seemed to indicate a heavy preponderance of spillage due to bottom damaging accidents. An additional three years (1971-1973) of spill data is now available which, when combined with the earlier data, weakens the original position. The combined data reveals that side damaging accidents are as much a problem as the bottom damaging ones, both with respect to frequency of occurrence and amounts spilled.

As a check on the validity of these figures for worldwide accidents, information on incidents occurring within 50 miles of the U.S. coastline was developed for the same years. The correlation between the data is good in the area of frequency of incidents and relative outflow by accident type. Other regional studies by the United Kingdom and Finland also confirm the validity of the statistics, thus indicating the desirability of a more general and flexible solution than simply requiring double bottoms.

Certain known statistical factors about casualties in U.S. waters must be kept in mind. Since collisions and groundings are statistically comparable hazards, it is desirable in determining vessel design to optimize the distribution of required segregated ballast space as protection against both hazards as fully as possible. The surrounding physical characteristics of a port area have a great deal to do with accident types to be anticipated. Where channels are wide and the water deep, collisions would be expected to dominate. Where water is shallow with respect to the drafts of vessels calling, groundings should be expected. There is a wide diversity of conditions encountered in U.S. ports and even within individual port areas. It is known that most accidents to tankers do not involve breaching of the hull. Likewise, a small number of accidents involve such high energy levels that no reasonable combination of construction features would be effective.

The distribution of segregated ballast spaces cannot be dictated solely by environmental protection considerations. Longitudinal strength, damage stability, safety with respect to fires and explosions,

personnel safety, and the fostering of sound operating practice, as well as the mitigation of oil outflow must also be taken into account.

In order to better assess the question of proper arrangement of segregated ballast tanks, the Coast Guard solicited the aid of a number of knowledgeable naval architects and operating personnel, which was constituted by the American Petroleum Institute as a task group, to address solely the problem of optimum distribution of required segregated ballast space taking into account all of the factors set forth in the preceding paragraph. The task group found some distributions of segregated ballast or design configurations that were superior to other configurations in mitigating outflow; however, they were also convinced that environmental protection could not be the sole factor examined in determining the safe and appropriate distribution of segregated ballast spaces. The text of the report of the task group more fully discusses the study, the methods used, and the results and conclusions of the group. This report appeared as an appendix to the final environmental impact statement, "Regulations for Tank Vessels Engaged in Carriage of Oil in Domestic Trade," which was made available to the public and the President's Council on Environmental Quality on August 15, 1975.

The Coast Guard carefully monitored the progress and work of the task group. Independent audits of the study by Mr. George C. Nickum, President of Nickum and Spaulding Associates, Inc., Seattle, Washington, and a member of the National Academy of Engineering; W. D. Gaither, Dean of the University of Delaware's College of Marine Studies, and Professor H. Benford, Professor of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering,

University of Michigan, have, without exception, found the study methodology sound and the results valid.

In view of the foregoing, the Coast Guard will not require double bottoms on tankers but will require distribution of segregated ballast in accordance with the proposed rules published in 40 FR 48289-48290. These rules are contained in Appendix I of this Report. These rules do not prohibit double bottoms. In fact, among the acceptable arrangements of segregated ballast under the proposed regulations as noted in Part A, Section ii of this Report are any one of the following:

1. Double bottoms.
2. Double sides.
3. "L" shaped wing tanks.
4. "J" shaped wing tanks.
5. Double hull.
6. Staggered wing tanks combined with reduced volume of intervening cargo tanks.

D. Other Coast Guard activities related to the Act.

Personnel Qualifications and Training

Historically, the response to International and Congressional mandates for more qualified seagoing personnel has been through on-the-job training and experience. An individual would present himself before the marine inspectors with acceptable proof of his experience and with recommendations as to his good character. Then he would either verbally or in writing satisfy the inspectors that he was possessed of the knowledge necessary for whatever licensed or unlicensed rating was desired.

Today, industry trends and technological advancement are raising questions concerning the traditional methods of the past. Automated ship systems have permitted a reduction in the number of crew to man ships which are substantially larger in size and carrying significantly more sophisticated cargoes in unique fashion. The individuals manning these ships must have the qualifications to respond to greater operational and maintenance responsibility. They must also have a broader scope of professional knowledge to recognize hazardous situations and respond effectively in emergencies.

Initial thinking has identified that the basic qualifications can continue to be measured by written or verbal examination. However, in areas of critical skills, a more specialized type of measurement is necessary. Since simulators are being developed for training of the marine oriented skills, they could also be utilized as a test vehicle or measure of skill achievement.

To provide a firm foundation for decisions, study efforts are in progress to evaluate the human element in collisions, ramming and

groundings and in the handling of flammable and dangerous cargoes in bulk. These evaluations will then be analyzed to establish effective levels of training and the best method to measure the individual's qualifications.

The study results will be used in conjunction with the regulatory efforts that are already advancing and which will establish the training and qualifications requirements for various tankerman endorsements. Additionally, regulations requiring firefighting training and periodic retraining may be called for which will supplement the tankerman regulations and may additionally require certain training for licensed and documented personnel on all ships. Included in the firefighting program may be training related to hazardous and dangerous cargoes in bulk.

Inspection Activities

Although the Pollution Prevention Regulations, 33 CFR Subchapter O, did not derive their authority from the Act, their intent follows that of the Act, i.e., protection of the environment from pollution of oil. When these regulations became effective, the Coast Guard commenced a program of boarding both United States and foreign flag vessels. From 1 July 1974 through 31 August 1975, 4,010 vessels have been boarded one or more times by Coast Guard personnel. This total represents 2,077 foreign flag vessels and 1,933 United States commercial vessels which have been examined for compliance with these regulations. These figures do not represent vessels which have inspections recorded in another manner such as on a Merchant Vessel Inspection Record Card. Presently, an average of 20 boardings per day are being reported to the National Response Center, Commandant (G-WEP-6).

A special boarding program was conducted for a 30-day period at three U.S. ports. During that time 300 vessels, foreign flag and domestic, were examined to ascertain the type and quantity of navigation equipment and the operating condition of same. On the basis of this sampling program, it was determined that regulations which would establish minimal standards for navigation equipment were necessary.

Fire and Explosion Prevention and Protection

On April 21, 1975, the Coast Guard published proposed amendments to the tank vessel regulations which will require upgrading of structural fire protection, installation of cargo tank inerting systems on certain vessels and increased capability of deck foam systems.

The amendments to the structural fire protection rules will increase the degree of segregation between accommodation spaces, machinery spaces, cargo control stations and cargo tanks.

Tankships over 100,000 deadweight tons and combination carriers (a vessel designed to carry liquid or solid bulk cargo) over 50,000 deadweight tons will be required to have an approved inert gas system for the cargo tanks. These inert gas systems should considerably reduce the chances of explosions.

The changes to the deck foam system regulations will improve the coverage of the cargo tanks and require the system to operate without recharging for a longer period so that larger fires can be fought.

The amendments will be applicable to vessels, the keels of which are laid on or after 1 January 1975. Comments received on the proposed rules have been reviewed and final rules will be published by January 1976.

Symposium on Marine Transportation

The Coast Guard, in cooperation with the Army Corps of Engineers and the Maritime Administration, sponsored a National Symposium on Marine Transportation Management in Philadelphia in May 1975. This meeting, attended by nearly 400 representatives of industry and government, was organized as an initial step in improving the cooperation and communication essential in accommodating the multitude of demands being placed on the U.S. marine transportation system. The Federal sponsors recognized that many of the current problems cannot be resolved by individual actions. Accommodations of the varying interests of the diverse groups involved must be worked out among the parties whose interests are affected.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Senate Report No. 92-724, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, entitled "Navigable Waters Safety and Environmental Quality Act of 1972."
2. U.S. Coast Guard, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Regulations for Tank Vessels Engaged in the Carriage of Oil in Domestic Trade; Protection of the Marine Environment, 15 August 1975.
3. U.S. Coast Guard, "A Report to Congress, Activities Relating to Title II Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972," January 1975.
4. Card, J. C., P. V. Ponce, and W. D. Snider, "Tankship Accidents and Resulting Oil Outflows, 1969-1973," 1975 Conference on Prevention and Control of Oil Pollution, API, EPA, USCG, San Francisco, California, 1975.

APPENDIX I

Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade
Protection of the Marine Environment

(40 FR 48280 - 48290)

federal register

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1975



PART IV:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

■

TANK VESSELS CARRYING OIL IN DOMESTIC TRADE

Protection of Marine Environment

**COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION**

Title 33—Navigation and Navigable Waters

CHAPTER I—COAST GUARD,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[CGD 74-32]

PART 151—OIL POLLUTION
REGULATIONSPART 157—RULES AND REGULATIONS
FOR PROTECTION OF THE MARINE
ENVIRONMENT RELATING TO TANK
VESSELS CARRYING OIL IN DOMESTIC
TRADETank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic
Trade

● **Purpose.** The purpose of these amendments to the pollution regulations is to add regulations that govern the design and operation of seagoing U.S. tank ships and barges of 150 gross tons and over that carry oil in the United States domestic trade. These regulations will effect in the immediate future a significant reduction of operational pollution from tank cleaning and deballasting operations from seagoing U.S. tank vessels in domestic trade. Additionally, these regulations will be extended to encompass the remainder of the U.S. seagoing vessels and foreign vessels trading into U.S. waters. Pollution caused by vessel casualties will be diminished as a consequence of the regulations. ●

In the January 26, 1973 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 2467), the Coast Guard published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking inviting comments from the public on proposed requirements for certain tank vessels to have segregated ballast that would be achieved in part by the fitting throughout the cargo length of double bottoms. In the July 5, 1973 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 17848), a notice was published informing the public that the Coast Guard intended to withhold action on the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking until the International Conference on Marine Pollution, 1973 was concluded and the results of that meeting evaluated.

After the Conference in October 1973, there followed a period of study and debate within the Coast Guard and with other federal agencies concerned with marine pollution prevention. Several policy questions had to be resolved:

(1) Should the United States accept the international standards specified in the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, or should unilateral action be taken to impose higher construction standards on U.S. vessels and foreign vessels entering our waters?

(2) If the United States were to accept the Convention standards which would apply to foreign ships and U.S. ships in foreign trade, what standards should be adopted for U.S. vessels in domestic trade?

(3) Should economic, social, legal, foreign policy, and safety considerations be reflected in the formulation of the regulations?

After considering the issues raised by these questions, the Coast Guard decided that the Convention although not perfect, did establish a reasonable and en-

vironmentally effective set of standards on which regulations for tank vessel construction could be based. The Coast Guard also decided that pollution regulations for all U.S. seagoing tank ships should be uniform, irrespective of the trade in which they are engaged. Based on these two decisions, proposed regulations conforming to the provisions of the Convention were published in the June 28, 1974 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 24150).

In developing the proposed regulations, the Coast Guard also complied with the mandate contained in Title II of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 (46 U.S.C. 391a) to consider: the need for such regulations; the extent to which such regulations will contribute to safety and/or protection of the marine environment; and the practicability of compliance with the regulations, including cost and technical feasibility.

In response to public and Congressional comment, the Coast Guard has reviewed the basis for the proposal and reaffirms its decision to base the regulations on the 1973 International Convention. Pollution of the oceans must be viewed as an international problem. Ocean winds and currents do not observe national boundaries. Many of the ocean areas of greatest productivity of sea life lie in international waters beyond the jurisdiction of any nation. World shipping and trade in petroleum are international in scope, with only a small portion of the U.S. supply of petroleum being transported in ships of American registry. Therefore, ship source pollution problems are best attacked in an international context with unilateral action reserved for those circumstances when international solutions are impossible or inappropriate.

Because of its potential effectiveness in reducing operational pollution, the best course of action is the implementation of the Convention coupled with vigorous efforts by the Coast Guard to improve crew training, manning standards, and operating standards for the reduction of both operational and accidental outflows.

A number of commenters asked why the Coast Guard did not distinguish between foreign and domestic trade and provide higher standards for U.S. vessels engaged in domestic trade. Some commenters interpreted Title II of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 (46 U.S.C. 391a), as amended by Section 401 of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (Public Law 93-153, 87 Stat. 576), as establishing that distinction. In the Coast Guard's opinion, the law does not permit a distinction between domestic and foreign vessels to be inferred from any treaty, convention, or international agreement. In addition, there is no safety or environmental basis for setting higher standards for U.S. domestic trade vessels since the characteristics of the operational situation external to the vessel determine the threat to the environment and to the safety of the vessel, not whether the vessel is engaged in foreign or domestic trade. Accordingly,

there is no mandate to issue, for U.S. tank vessels engaged in carrying oil in domestic trade, rules which set a higher standard than those rules that will apply to other U.S. vessels and to foreign vessels while in United States jurisdiction.

Existing regulations governing tanker construction and operation, issued under R.S. 4417a, as amended (46 U.S.C. 391a) and promulgated in 46 CFR Subchapters D and O, make no distinction between tank vessels engaged in domestic trade and those engaged in foreign trade. Requirements for seagoing tank vessels have been based on the vessel size, the duration of the voyage, the exposure to hazards (i.e., bad weather, rough sea conditions, vessel traffic), and the characteristics of the cargo carried. If distinctions in tanker construction requirements concerned with safety and pollution prevention were to be based on "foreign" and "domestic" trade routes, the result would be different standards for vessels engaged in essentially identical voyage routes. For example, a vessel on a "foreign" voyage from a Caribbean port, another on a "domestic" voyage from the Gulf coast, both sailing along the east coast of the United States, are subject to identical risks. The Coast Guard has concluded that safety requirements should be concerned with the risks involved and not on trade route distinctions.

Another reason for not distinguishing between tankers in foreign and domestic trade is the need to allow owners the flexibility to use vessels in either trade as business opportunities change. Several commenters doubted the validity of this reason. Therefore, the Coast Guard examined the voyage records of 272 U.S. seagoing tank vessels; only 66 vessels had engaged exclusively in domestic trade during the sample time period. Those 66 were generally vessels of less than 15,000 gross tons, and at least 15 were carrying bulk cargoes other than petroleum, such as sulphur, wine, and similar dry and liquid cargoes.

Since the amendments are based on the Convention, several commenters suggested that the Convention wording be used. While adequate for the purposes of international agreement for implementation by states parties, the language of the Convention is not in all cases considered by the Coast Guard as being specific enough for legal sufficiency.

There were several comments concerning the dates in the definition of "new vessel" each of which proposed a delay in the applicability of the requirements. The Coast Guard found no support for further delay and accordingly did not adopt the suggested changes.

Several commenters suggested that the Coast Guard should establish cutoff dates after which existing vessels not fully in compliance with the proposed requirements for new vessels would be removed from service in U.S. waters. Existing vessels are required to be upgraded by the use of slop tanks, separators, oil discharge monitoring and control systems, and the alteration of piping. These are design and equipment requirements that will improve the ability of the vessel to

avoid routine operational discharges. It is not practicable to retroactively apply the segregated ballast requirements of these regulations to existing vessels. The Coast Guard is participating in a study of the cost and feasibility of some type of retrofitted segregated ballast requirement. This study is being conducted by a working group of the National Committee for the Prevention of Marine Pollution.

The proposed revision to the oil record book requirement in § 151.35(c)(1)(v) has been changed to state that it is applicable only to the side valves, that is, the valves on the cargo transfer manifold where the oil is transferred to or from the shore during loading or discharge. The remainder of the valves in the oil and ballast system are covered by the other entries in the oil record book.

Several commenters suggested that the definition of clean ballast in proposed § 157.03(e) is not clear and differs from the Convention meaning. The proposed definition agrees with current U.S. regulations (see 40 CFR Part 110) and has not been changed. Discussions between the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency are being held on the question of whether confirmation by monitor records that a discharge did not exceed 15 parts per million oil in water provides a legal defense. Changes in the regulations may be proposed after these discussions.

One commenter noted that the proposed definition of deadweight in § 157.03(g) was at variance with the Convention and this definition has been changed to conform with the Convention.

Several commenters suggested that petrochemicals should be excluded from the proposed definition of "oil." Petrochemicals have not been classified with respect to pollution potential. When 46 CFR Subchapter 0 is revised to incorporate the provisions of Annex II of the Convention, the classification problem will be addressed in more detail. As suggested, petrochemicals are now excluded from the definition of oil. The definition has been reworded for clarification.

One commenter suggested that the definition of segregated ballast in proposed § 157.03(r) should include the Convention alternative of ballast cargoes other than oil or noxious substances. This suggestion has not been adopted since no substances have been identified or suggested for regular use as an alternative to water ballast.

One commenter questioned whether proposed § 157.05(a) represented a step toward adoption of the metric system. The formulas in these regulations require conversion from customary units to SI units before entering values into the formulas. This use of the metric system will increase in the coming years.

One commenter suggested that the Commandant of the Coast Guard should reserve the option of accepting an operating requirement in lieu of a construction requirement under proposed § 157.07. The adoption of that suggestion would conflict with a Convention provision expressly intended to preclude such a practice. The Coast Guard agrees

with the Convention philosophy and will not adopt the suggestion.

Commenters noted that some requirements of proposed Subpart B are inappropriate for most seagoing tank barges. Generally, unmanned seagoing tank barges do not take ballast into cargo tanks or clean cargo tanks while at sea. Accordingly, § 157.08 has been rewritten and § 157.28 has been added to reflect this operating practice. Also, § 157.08 has been changed to exempt barges constructed to inland standards from the requirements in §§ 157.19 and 157.21.

Many commenters were critical of the fact that the segregated ballast requirement in proposed § 157.09 did not include vessels smaller than 70,000 tonnage DWT. The United States negotiating position at the Conference was in favor of extending the segregated ballast requirements to all new vessels of 20,000 tonnage DWT or more, but this position was not accepted by the majority at the Conference. Discussion at the Conference for and against extending segregated ballast requirements to cover vessels from 20,000 tonnage DWT to 70,000 tonnage DWT centered on the effectiveness of such requirements in reducing operational pollution. Segregated ballast would not be effective in preventing operational pollution from tank vessels smaller than 70,000 tonnage DWT because most of these vessels carry petroleum products rather than crude oil. These vessels must frequently wash tanks for cargo purity reasons. Since clean cargo tanks are then available for ballasting, segregated ballast is unnecessary.

Proposed § 157.09(b) (redesignated § 157.09(a)) concerning segregated ballast tank capacity has been revised in response to criticism that the proposal created an unreasonable burden on the shipbuilder and shipowner to show the adequacy of segregated ballast capacity for ballast voyages. The master must have a vessel with adequate segregated ballast capacity for safe operation. The amount of ballast needed for safe operation is a matter that in the past has been usually left to the judgment of the vessel's master. Considerable effort on the part of naval architects, shipowners, and government agencies has gone into trying to determine a reasonable ballast level for most circumstances. The draft and trim requirements in the Convention, contained in proposed § 157.09(c) (redesignated § 157.09(b)), are based on the current collective judgment of world experts. The validity of these levels will have to be verified by satisfactory operating experience in the future. The responsibility for determining how much ballast is needed for safe operations remains with the vessel's master. He may take additional ballast in cargo tanks during severe weather if in his judgment it is necessary (see § 157.35).

Comments indicated that the proposal was not clear as to whether the draft and trim requirements are design criteria or operating restrictions. Section 157.09(b) has been changed to require the designed-in segregated ballast capacity to

be sufficient for the ship to meet the draft and trim requirements in any ballast condition including the condition "light-weight with only segregated ballast." Section 157.09(d) (redesignated § 157.09(c)) has been changed to allow additional ballast to be carried in more than one cargo tank under abnormally severe weather conditions, as described in § 157.35.

Many commenters were critical of the fact that the proposed regulations did not require double bottoms. In addition, the proposal did not contain standards concerned with the specific placement of segregated ballast within the vessel. The commenters suggested that if segregated ballast was needed to control operational pollution, it should be distributed to serve as protective space to mitigate the outflow in cases of collisions, ramming, and groundings. Though the Convention does not specify how segregated ballast spaces should be distributed, the suggestion that the spaces can have a secondary use by proper arrangement to give some protection in the case of accidents has merit.

A new paragraph (d) has been added to § 157.09 to state the requirement that was unstated but implicit in proposal: distribution of the segregated ballast must be acceptable to the Coast Guard.

On page 48289 in this issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER the Coast Guard publishes a notice of proposed rulemaking amending these rules. These proposed changes relate specifically to the limited issue of how the required segregated ballast must be distributed.

Proposed § 157.11 has been reworded for clarification. Paragraph (c) has been changed to state that a manifold includes a cargo or ballast manifold that can be used to transfer dirty ballast water or an oily mixture to a reception facility.

One comment with respect to proposed § 157.13 suggested that the requirement was impractical because in many cases a cantilevered structure extending beyond the deck edge would be necessary to visually observe the discharge. This same commenter suggested that it would be sufficient to observe the effluent in the sea. The Coast Guard rejects this concept on the basis that it is not satisfactory or sufficient to observe the wake. The overboard discharges must be so located to be observed from the deck.

In response to several comments, proposed § 157.15 has been rewritten. References to baffles, weirs, and similar separation aids within the slop tank have been eliminated. The requirement for separate inlet and outlet connections has been retained since this is a basic prerequisite for decanting water from the slop tank. Slop tank design that provides effective and efficient oil/water separation is a developing art so it is not possible to provide specific design requirements at this time.

One commenter pointed out that Regulation 15(2)(a) in the Convention provides that on existing vessels any cargo tank may be designated a slop tank if suitable piping is installed. Nothing in the proposal is in conflict with Regula-

tion 157.21(a) concerning this use of cargo tanks. The Coast Guard anticipates that existing vessels will be modified to use existing cargo tanks as slop tanks; however, proposed § 157.15 has been changed to make it clear that slop tanks may carry cargo as is customary in the Load-On-Top (LOT) methods.

Several commenters suggested that "adequate capacity" for the oily residue tank required in proposed § 157.17(b) should be more definitively stated. The Coast Guard feels that the owner and shipbuilder are in the best position to determine the capacity needed for oily residue in view of the variables involved.

One commenter suggested that the dates in proposed § 157.19 concerning cargo tank arrangement and size should be made to correspond with dates defining a new vessel in § 157.03. This is not possible in view of the fact that the dates in this section are established in 33 U.S.C. 1004a, which is based on IMCO recommendations.

In response to several comments, the Coast Guard added an interpretation of paragraph 3.3 of Annex C of the 1971 amendments to the 1954 Convention to the pollution regulations in 33 CFR 151.50 (39 FR 30125). This interpretative rule allows a U.S. tank barge of 150 meters or less to be constructed with essentially the same bulkhead spacing as a tankship of comparable cargo capacity.

One commenter questioned whether sluice gates used in cargo transfer systems are considered "valves" under proposed § 157.19(c). While sluice gates are usually larger and not as tight as gate, globe, or butterfly valves used in cargo systems, the Coast Guard considers them to be "valves" under § 157.19(c).

In response to several comments, proposed § 157.19(d) has been rewritten to require that if a line of piping that runs through a cargo tank in a position less than t, from the vessel's side or less than v, from the vessel's bottom, as defined in Appendix A, has a branch, that branch must have a valve within each cargo tank into which the branch opens. The valve may be at the bulkhead where the branch line enters the tanks, at the end of the branch adjacent to the opening, or anywhere in the branch within the tank.

Proposed § 157.21(a)(3) (redesignated § 157.21(c)) has been rewritten to state the criteria that must be satisfied in determining acceptable stability after damage.

Proposed § 157.21(a)(4) has been omitted from the final regulations. The proposal was included to account for cross-flooding; however, cross-flooding was not included in the Convention regulations.

One commenter suggested that proposed § 157.21(b) (redesignated § 157.24(b)) be rewritten on his assumption that it would be impossible for a designer or builder to submit stability data at the same time the contract plans and specifications are submitted. The Coast Guard considers plan review a continuous process. It is normal practice for a designer to prepare preliminary estimates of a vessel's stability as part of the contract plans and specifications. From the time

the Coast Guard review process begins and until the time the vessel is certified, the calculations can be revised and refined by the submitter.

Several commenters felt that the cargo and ballast system information required by proposed § 157.23 is redundant, citing requirements for oil transfer procedures presently contained in 33 CFR 155.750. While there may be some overlap, § 155.750 specifically concerns oil transfer operations at a terminal, but § 157.23 requires information necessary to carry out retention-on-board operations while underway. It may be desirable for some vessels to combine the information required by these rules into one manual.

The proposed requirement in § 157.23 that the instruction manual be submitted for Coast Guard approval has been omitted. The owner must furnish the vessel a manual containing his vessel's cargo and ballast information, and furnishing the vessel with a copy of the "Clean Seas Guide for Oil Tankers" would not meet this requirement. The information required must be available on board the vessel and for Coast Guard examination during boardings.

Several commenters took exception to the prohibition against carrying ballast water in fuel tanks on new vessels contained in proposed § 157.33. The Coast Guard believes that this objection is based upon a misunderstanding of the background of Regulation 14(2) of Annex I of the Convention. It was the intent of the Convention to prohibit ballasting of fuel tanks on new vessels. The abnormal circumstances in Regulation 14(2) refer to a small number of vessels that stay at sea for long periods, such as fishing, whale, factory, or other vessels deployed to remote areas such as the Arctic or Antarctic. Since the proposal did not concern those vessels, the prohibition was not changed.

A question on ballasting of fuel tanks concerned the use of a dual purpose ballast/fuel tank (i.e., a tank used for fuel when the vessel is on a trade route requiring long voyages and used for ballast when the vessel is on a short voyage route). If a vessel has a dual purpose tank, a requirement will be noted during the Coast Guard plan review process that the piping to the particular dual purpose tank must contain spool pieces that can be inserted into either the fuel piping or the ballast piping depending on how the tank is being used.

One comment requested clarification of the phrase "is proceeding enroute" in proposed § 157.37(a)(2). The words in this phrase are used in their dictionary meaning which is "moving on or along the way." In other words, the vessel must be moving through the water. It cannot be anchored or drifting. This will not prohibit a vessel from going to sea solely for the purpose of cleaning tanks before entering a repair yard so long as the criteria in § 157.37 are met.

One commenter noted that proposed § 157.37(a)(5) (redesignated § 157.37(a)(6)) was incomplete since it did not specify how to operate in case of failure of the automatic oil discharge and monitoring and control system. This paragraph

has been rewritten to include requirements in case of failure that allows manual operation of the system. Another commenter suggested that proposed § 157.37(b) should have a broader application than only vessels that carry asphalt. This suggestion is not adopted. The only reason an exception exists for asphalt vessels is because of the inability to clean and consolidate the cargo residues while at sea.

Several commenters noted the impracticability of compliance with proposed § 157.43 in the case of a vessel fitted with double bottoms having no access from the deck. This section has been rewritten to allow the discharge without first visually examining the top of the contents of the tank if the ballast content is tested with an oil/water interface detector or a similar device.

Proposed § 157.45 has been changed to acknowledge that the need for either cargo or ballast transfer may arise while the vessel is at sea necessitating the opening of valves and closing devices. The phrases "closing devices" and "transfer system" are used to include those vessels using sluice gates in tank bulkheads. Valves and closing devices are required to be closed at sea, except when in use, in order that the vessel meets the stability requirement.

Proposed § 157.49 has been changed to reflect its applicability to persons operating cargo and ballast systems of a tank vessel.

Several commenters noted an omission in Appendix A for the installation of emergency high suction transfer systems. This was an oversight and this optional installation has now been added to Appendix A.

One commenter noted that proposed footnote 2 of paragraph 4(b) in Appendix B appeared to be more stringent than the Convention requirements since it specifies the use of the actual density of the cargo in order to perform the calculations. This was included to ensure that the designers used a representative cargo density in the calculations to rectify the omission of a Convention specification. Proposed paragraph 4(d) of Appendix B has been rewritten to reflect the latest Convention recommendation on free surface effect calculations.

In consideration of the foregoing, the proposed regulations that appear in the June 28, 1974 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 24150) are hereby adopted subject to the changes discussed in the preceding paragraphs. It was Congressional intent that the regulations be effective not later than June 30, 1974 and any further delay would be contrary to public interest. Accordingly, it is found necessary to make the regulations effective on October 14, 1975.

A Final Environmental Impact Statement, "Regulations for Tank Vessels Engaged in the Carriage of Oil in Domestic Trade", has been prepared on the regulations in this document, and was made available to the President's Council on Environmental Quality and the public on August 15, 1975. The statement contains additional and more detailed informa-

tion. Copies are available upon request to the Executive Secretary (G-CMC/82), U.S. Coast Guard, Washington, DC 20590.

The inflationary impact of the requirements in this document was evaluated in accordance with the criteria contained in the Department's Interim Guidance for the Preparation of Inflation Impact Statements. Under the evaluation, these requirements are found not to be a major proposal and a Negative Declaration has been prepared. Copies are available upon request to the Executive Secretary (G-CMC/82), U.S. Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. 20590.

I certify that the Interim Rules and Regulations for the Protection of the Marine Environment Relating to Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade is not a major proposal in accordance with Executive Order 11821, dated November 27, 1974, and Departmental implementing instructions.

In consideration of the foregoing, chapter 1 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

1. Section 151.35 (c) and (d) (2) is revised to read as follows:

§ 151.35 Oil record book.

(c) If an operations listed in this paragraph occurs, the Oil Record Book must be completed in accordance with the requirements contained in paragraph (e) of this section.

(1) The following operation on a tanker must be recorded on a tank-to-tank basis:

(i) Loading of oil cargo.

(ii) Internal transfer of oil cargo during a voyage.

(iii) Opening or closing before and after loading and unloading operations of valves or similar devices that interconnect cargo tanks.

(iv) Opening or closing of means of communication between cargo piping and seawater ballast piping.

(v) Opening or closing of valves at hose connection points at ends of cargo transfer manifolds before, during, and after loading and unloading operations.

(vi) Unloading of oil cargo.

(vii) Ballasting of cargo tanks.

(viii) Cleaning of cargo tanks.

(ix) Discharge of ballast except from segregated ballast tanks.

(x) Discharge of water from slop tanks.

(xi) Disposal of residues.

(xii) Discharge overboard in port or at sea of bilge water accumulated in machinery spaces.

(2) The following operations on a ship other than a tanker must be recorded on a tank-to-tank basis:

(i) Ballasting, or cleaning during voyage, of bunker fuel tanks.

(ii) Disposal of oily residues from bunker fuel tanks or other sources.

(d)

(2) The escape of oil or an oily mixture resulting from—

(i) damage to the ship;

(ii) unavoidable leakage; or

(iii) any accident or other exceptional circumstance.

2. Subchapter O is amended by adding Part 157 to read as follows:

Subpart A—General

- Sec. 157.01 Purpose.
- 157.02 Definitions.
- 157.05 Performing calculations for this part.
- 157.07 Equivalents.

Subpart B—Design and Equipment

- 157.08 Applicability.
- 157.09 Segregated ballast.
- 157.11 Pumping, piping, and discharge arrangements.
- 157.13 Designated observation area.
- 157.15 Slop tanks in tank vessels.
- 157.17 Oily residue tank.
- 157.19 Cargo tank arrangement and size.
- 157.21 Subdivision and stability.
- 157.22 Reserved.
- 157.23 Cargo and ballast system information.
- 157.24 Submission of calculations, plans, and specifications.

Subpart C—Vessel Operation

- 157.25 Applicability.
- 157.27 Discharges: tank vessels carrying oil exclusively on rivers, lakes, bays, sounds, and the Great Lakes, and seagoing tank vessels of less than 150 gross tons.
- 157.28 Discharges from tank barges exempted from certain design requirements.
- 157.29 Discharges: seagoing tank vessels of 150 gross tons or more.
- 157.31 Discharges: chemical additives.
- 157.33 Water ballast in oil fuel tanks.
- 157.35 Ballast added to cargo tanks.
- 157.37 Discharge of cargo residue.
- 157.39 Machinery space bilges.
- 157.41 Emergencies.
- 157.43 Discharge in port or at an offshore terminal.
- 157.45 Valves in cargo or ballast piping system.
- 157.47 Information for master.
- 157.49 Instruction manual.

Appendix A Damage assumptions, hypothetical outflows, and cargo tank size and arrangements.

Appendix B Subdivision and Stability Assumptions.

AUTHORITY: R.S. 4417a(3) and (7), as amended (46 U.S.C. 391a(3) and (7)); 49 CFR 1.46(n)(4).

Subpart A—General

§ 157.01 Purpose.

The purpose of the regulations in this part is to prescribe design, equipment and operation requirements for seagoing United States tank vessels engaged in the carriage of oil in domestic trade that are in addition to those requirements in 46 CFR Subchapters D and O.

§ 157.03 Definitions.

A used in this part:

(a) "Length" or "L" means the distance in meters from the fore side of the stem to the axis of the rudder stock on a waterline at 85 percent of the least molded depth measured from the molded baseline, or 96 percent of the total length on that waterline, whichever is greater. In vessels designed with drag, the water line is measured parallel to the designed waterline.

(b) "Amidships" means the middle of the length.

(c) "Breadth" or "B" means the maximum molded breadth of a vessel in meters.

(d) "Center tank" means any tank in-board of a longitudinal bulkhead.

(e) "Clean ballast" means the ballast in a cargo tank which, if discharged from a vessel that is stationary into clean, calm water on a clear day, would not—

(1) produce visible traces of oil on the surface of the water or on adjoining shore lines; or

(2) cause a sludge or emulsion to be deposited beneath the surface of the water or upon adjoining shore lines.

(f) "Combination carrier" means a vessel designed to carry oil or solid cargoes in bulk.

(g) "Deadweight" or "DWT" means the difference in metric tons between the lightweight displacement and the total displacement of a vessel measured in water of specific gravity 1.025 at the load waterline corresponding to the assigned summer freeboard.

(h) "Lightweight" means the displacement of a vessel in metric tons without cargo, oil fuel, lubricating oil, ballast water, fresh water, and feedwater in tanks, consumable stores, and any persons and their effects.

(i) "New Vessel" means a vessel that—

(1) is constructed under a contract awarded after December 31, 1974;

(2) in the absence of a building contract, has the keel laid or is at a similar stage of construction after June 30, 1975;

(3) is delivered after December 31, 1977; or

(4) has undergone a major conversion for which—

(i) the contract is awarded after December 31, 1974;

(ii) in the absence of a contract, conversion is begun after June 30, 1975; or

(iii) conversion is completed after December 31, 1977.

(j) "Existing vessel" means any vessel that is not a new vessel.

(k) "Major conversion" means a conversion of an existing vessel that—

(1) substantially alters the dimensions or carrying capacity of the vessel;

(2) changes the type of the vessel; or

(3) substantially prolongs the vessel's service life.

(l) "From the nearest land" means from the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is established in accordance with international law.

(m) "Instantaneous rate of discharge of oil content" means the rate of discharge of oil in liters per hour at any instant, divided by the speed of the vessel in knots at the same instant.

(n) "Oil" means oil of any kind or in any form, except petrochemicals, and includes but is not limited to petroleum, fuel oil, sludge, oil refuse, and oil mixed with wastes other than dredged spoil.

(o) "Oil fuel" means any oil used as fuel for machinery in the vessel in which it is carried.

(p) "Oily mixture" means a mixture with any oil content.

(q) "Permeability of a space" means the ratio of the volume within a space

RULES AND REGULATIONS

that is assumed to be occupied by water to the total volume of that space.

(r) "Segregated ballast" means the ballast water introduced into a tank that is completely separated from the cargo oil and oil fuel system and that is permanently allocated to the carriage of ballast.

(s) "Slop tank" means a tank specifically designated for the collection of cargo drainings, washings, and other oil mixtures.

(t) "Tank" means an enclosed space that is formed by the permanent structure of a vessel, and designed for the carriage of liquid in bulk.

(u) "Tank barge" means a tank vessel not equipped with a means of self-propulsion.

(v) "Tank vessel" means a vessel that is specially constructed or converted to carry liquid bulk cargo in tanks and includes tankers, tankships, tank barges, and combination carriers when carrying oil cargoes in bulk.

(w) "U.S. vessel" means a vessel that is owned, documented, or registered in the United States and is not a public vessel.

(x) "Wing tank" means a tank that is located adjacent to the side shell plating.

(y) "Tankship" means a tank vessel propelled by mechanical power or sail.

(z) "Domestic trade" means trade between ports or places within the United States, its territories and possessions, either directly or via a foreign port including trade on the navigable rivers, lakes, and inland waters.

§ 157.05 Performing calculations for this part.

In this part, unless the context requires otherwise—

(a) formulas are in the International System of Units (SI);

(b) values used in those formulas must be in the International System of Units; and

(c) forward and after perpendiculars are located at the forward end and at the after end of the length. The forward perpendicular coincides with the foreside of the stem on the waterline on which the length of the vessel is measured.

§ 157.07 Equivalents.

The Coast Guard may accept an equivalent, in accordance with the procedure in 46 CFR 30.15-1, of a design or an equipment to fulfill a requirement in this part except an operational method may not be substituted for a design or equipment requirement.

Subpart B—Design and Equipment

§ 157.08 Applicability.

(a) The requirements in this subpart apply to seagoing tank vessels of 150 gross tons or more except as follows:

(1) The requirements in §§ 157.11, 157.13, and 157.15 do not apply to a tank vessel that carries asphalt exclusively.

(2) The requirements in §§ 157.11, 157.13, 157.15, and 157.23 do not apply to a tank barge that can not ballast cargo tanks or wash cargo tanks while proceeding en route.

(3) The requirements in §§ 157.19 and 157.21 do not apply to a tank barge whose certificate is endorsed by the Coast Guard for a limited short protected coastwise route if the barge is constructed and certificated primarily for service on an inland route.

(b) The requirements in § 157.21 also apply to tank vessels engaged in the carriage of oil on the navigable waters of the Great Lakes.

§ 157.09 Segregated ballast.

(a) A new vessel of 70,000 tons DWT or more must have segregated ballast tanks that have a total capacity to allow the vessel to meet the draft and trim requirements in paragraph (b) of this section without recourse to the use of oil tanks for water ballast.

(b) In any ballast condition during any part of a voyage, including that of lightweight with only segregated ballast, the vessel's drafts and trim must have the capability of meeting each of the following requirements:

(1) The molded draft amidship (dm) in meters without taking into account vessel deformation must not be less than dm in the following mathematical relationship:

$$dm \geq 0 + 0.02L$$

(2) The drafts at the forward and after perpendiculars must correspond to those determined by the draft amidship as specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this section, in association with the trim by the stern of no more than 0.015L.

(3) The minimum allowable draft at the after perpendicular is that which is necessary to obtain full immersion of the propeller.

(c) The vessel may be designed to carry ballast water in cargo tanks during the condition described in § 157.35.

(d) The distribution of the segregated ballast spaces within the cargo tank area must be acceptable to the Coast Guard.

§ 157.11 Pumping, piping, and discharge arrangements.

(a) Each tank vessel must have a fixed piping system arranged for the—

(1) transfer of dirty ballast residue and tank washings from each cargo tank to a slop tank;

(2) discharge to the sea under § 157.37; and

(3) discharge in a port or at an offshore terminal under § 157.43.

(b) Each tank vessel must have the fixed piping system arranged to, for discharges under paragraph (a)(2) of this section, terminate above the weather deck or on the vessel's side above the waterline of the deepest ballast condition.

(c) Each tank vessel must have a cargo or ballast discharge manifold that—

(1) is located on the weather deck;

(2) terminates on each side of the vessel; and

(3) is connected to the piping system required in paragraph (a)(1) of this section for the transfer to a reception facility of oily mixtures that cannot be discharged under §§ 157.37 or 157.43.

NOTE: An existing vessel must comply with the requirements in § 157.11 before December 31, 1977.

§ 157.13 Designated observation area.

A new vessel must have a designated observation area on the weather deck or above that is—

(a) located so that the effluent from the pipeline terminations required in § 157.11(a) and the manifold required in § 157.11(c) may be visually observed; and

(b) equipped with—

(1) a means to directly stop the discharge of effluent into the sea; or

(2) a positive communication system, such as a telephone or a radio, between the observation area and the discharge control position.

§ 157.15 Slop tanks in tank vessels.

(a) Number. A tank vessel must have the following number of slop tanks that comply with the requirements of this section:

(1) A new vessel of less than 70,000 tons DWT and an existing vessel must have at least one slop tank.

(2) A new vessel of 70,000 tons DWT or more must have at least two slop tanks.

(b) Capacity. Slop tanks required in this section must have a capacity to retain two percent or more of the oil carrying capacity of the vessel except nonsegregated ballast tank vessels that have tank eductors installed must have a slop tank capacity of three percent or more of the oil carrying capacity of the vessel.

(c) Design. A slop tank required in this section—

(1) must minimize turbulence, entrainment of oil, and the creation of an emulsion by the use of separate inlet and outlet connections; and

(2) may carry bulk oil when not being used as a slop tank.

NOTE: An existing vessel must comply with the requirements in § 157.15 before December 31, 1977.

§ 157.17 Oily residue tank.

(a) A tank vessel of 400 gross tons or more must have a tank that receives and holds oily residue resulting from purification of fuel and lubricating oil and from oil leakages in machinery spaces.

(b) Each oily residue tank required in paragraph (a) of this section must have an adequate capacity that is determined by the—

(1) type of machinery installed on the vessel; and

(2) maximum fuel oil capacity.

(c) Each oily residue tank on a new vessel must be designed to facilitate—

(1) cleaning; and

(2) discharging to a reception facility.

NOTE: An existing vessel must comply with the requirements in § 157.17 (a) and (b) before December 31, 1977.

§ 157.19 Cargo tank arrangement and size.

(a) The requirements in this section apply to—

(1) a new vessel;

(2) a tank vessel delivered after January 1, 1977; and

(3) a tank vessel that is delivered before January 1, 1977, for which the building contract is awarded after January 1, 1972, or, if there is no building contract, the keel is laid or the vessel is at a similar stage of construction after June 30, 1972.

(b) As determined in accordance with the procedures contained in Appendix A of this part, each cargo tank must be of such size and arrangement that—

(1) the hypothetical outflow for side damage (O_s) or for bottom damage (O_b) anywhere within the length of the vessel must not exceed O_A (30,000 cubic meters or 400 \bar{v} DWT, whichever is greater, limited to a maximum of 40,000 cubic meters);

(2) the volume of each wing tank and center tank is less than the allowable volume of a wing tank (VOL_w) and the allowable volume of a center tank (VOL_c) respectively; and

(3) the length of a tank is less than the allowable length of a tank (l_a).

(c) If a cargo transfer system interconnects two or more cargo tanks, the system must have valves to segregate the tanks from each other.

(d) If a line of piping that runs through a cargo tank in a position less than l_c from the vessel's side or less than v_c from the vessel's bottom, as defined in Appendix A of this part, has a branch, that branch must have a valve within each cargo tank into which the branch opens.

(e) If piping that serves suction wells is installed within a double bottom, that piping must be—

(1) fitted with valves located at the point of connection to the tank served to prevent oil outflow in the event of damage to the piping; and

(2) designed to be installed as high from the bottom shell as possible.

NOTE: Vessels within the categories in § 157.19(a)(3) must meet the requirements in § 157.19 before December 31, 1976. If a vessel is constructed under a contract that was awarded before January 1, 1974 and does not carry crude oil, fuel oil, heavy diesel oil, or lubricating oil; the requirements in § 157.19 do not apply.

CROSS REFERENCE: See 33 CFR 151.50 (30 FR 30125) for an interpretative rule concerning tank arrangement and size limitations applicable to seagoing tank barges.

§ 157.21 Subdivision and stability.

A new vessel must meet the following subdivision and damage stability criteria after assuming side and bottom damage as defined in Appendix B of this part. A vessel that meets the requirements in this section is considered by the Coast Guard as meeting 46 CFR 42.20-5.

(a) The final waterline, taking into account sinkage, heel, and trim, must be below the lower edge of an opening through which progressive flooding may take place, such as an air pipe, or any opening that is closed by means of a watertight door or hatch cover. This opening does not include an opening closed by a—

- (1) watertight manhole cover;
- (2) flush scuttle;

(3) small watertight cargo tank hatch cover that maintains the high integrity of the deck;

(4) remotely operated watertight sliding door; or

(5) side scuttle of the non-opening type.

(b) In the final stage of flooding, the angle of heel due to unsymmetrical flooding must not exceed 25 degrees, except that this angle may be increased to 30 degrees if no deck edge immersion occurs.

(c) For acceptable stability in the final stage of flooding, the righting lever curve must have a range of at least 20 degrees beyond the position of equilibrium in association with a maximum residual righting lever of at least 0.1 meter. For the calculations required in this section, watertight openings or openings fitted with automatic closures, (e.g. a vent fitted with a ball check valve), need not be considered as points of downflooding within the range of residual stability, but other openings must be accounted for in the calculation.

§ 157.22 [Reserved]

§ 157.23 Cargo and ballast system information.

(a) Each tank vessel to which this part applies must have an instruction manual that describes the automatic and manual operation of the cargo and ballast system in the vessel.

(b) The format and information contained in the instruction manual required in paragraph (a) of this section must be similar to the manual entitled "Clean Seas Guide for Oil Tankers" which can be obtained from the International Chamber of Shipping, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London, England, EC3A 8ET.

§ 157.24 Submission of calculations, plans, and specifications.

The owner, builder, or designer of a new vessel shall submit the following to the Coast Guard before construction of the vessel:

(a) Calculations to substantiate compliance with the tank arrangement and size requirements in § 157.19(b).

(b) Calculations to substantiate compliance with subdivision and damage stability requirements in § 157.21.

(c) [Reserved]

(d) Plans and specifications required in 46 CFR 31.10-5 that include—

(1) the design characteristics of the vessel, the arrangements, configuration, and contents of the assumed damaged compartments; and

(2) the distributions, specific gravities, and the free surface effect of liquids.

Subpart C—Vessel Operation

§ 157.25 Applicability.

This subpart prescribes regulations for the discharging of clean ballast, segregated ballast, and oil mixtures from, and for the carriage of ballast water by—

(a) tank vessels carrying oil exclusively on rivers, lakes, bays, sounds, and the Great Lakes; and

(b) seagoing tank vessels.

§ 157.27 Discharges: Tank vessels carrying oil exclusively on rivers, lakes, bays, sounds, and the Great Lakes, and seagoing tank vessels of less than 150 gross tons.

Unless a tank vessel carrying oil exclusively on rivers, lakes, bays, sounds, and the Great Lakes, or a seagoing tank vessel of less than 150 gross tons discharges clean ballast or segregated ballast, the vessel must—

- (a) retain on board any oily mixture; or
- (b) transfer an oily mixture to a reception facility.

§ 157.28 Discharges from tank barges exempted from certain design requirements.

The person in charge of a tank barge exempted under § 157.09(a)(2) from the requirements in §§ 157.11, 157.13, 157.15, and 157.23 shall ensure that while the barge is proceeding en route—

- (a) cargo tanks are not ballasted or washed; and
- (b) oil or oily mixtures are not discharged.

§ 157.29 Discharges: Seagoing tank vessels of 150 gross tons or more.

Unless a seagoing tank vessel of 150 gross tons or more discharges an oily mixture in compliance with the requirements in §§ 157.37, 157.39, or 157.43, the vessel must—

- (a) retain the mixture; or
- (b) transfer the mixture to a reception facility.

§ 157.31 Discharges: Chemical additives.

No person may use a chemical additive to circumvent the discharge requirements in §§ 157.27, 157.29, 157.37, 157.39, and 157.43.

§ 157.33 Water ballast in oil fuel tanks.

A new vessel may not carry ballast water in an oil fuel tank.

§ 157.35 Ballast added to cargo tanks.

A tank vessel that meets the design requirement in § 157.09 may carry water ballast in cargo tanks during abnormally severe weather conditions if more ballast water than can be carried in segregated ballast tanks is required for the safety of the vessel. This ballast water must be—

(a) processed and discharged in compliance with the requirements in § 157.37; and

(b) recorded in the Oil Record Book under § 151.35(c)(1)(vii) of this chapter.

§ 157.37 Discharge of cargo residue.

(a) Except as required in paragraph (b) of this section, a tank vessel may discharge into the sea an oily mixture from a cargo tank and cargo pump room bilge if the vessel—

(1) is more than 50 nautical miles from the nearest land;

(2) is proceeding en route;

(3) is discharging at an instantaneous rate of oil content not exceeding 60 liters per nautical mile;

(4) is an existing vessel and the total quantity of oil discharged into the sea

RULES AND REGULATIONS

does not exceed 1/15,000 of the total quantity of the cargo that the discharge formed a part, or is a new vessel and the total quantity of oil discharged into the sea does not exceed 1/30,000 of the total quantity of the cargo that the discharge formed a part;

(5) discharges above the waterline through the piping required in §157.11 (a); and

(6) has in operation an automatic oil discharge monitoring and control system approved by the Coast Guard (specification regulation to be proposed), except that system may be operated manually if—

(i) the automatic system fails during a ballast voyage;

(ii) the failure is recorded in the Oil Record Book;

(iii) the master ensures that the discharge is constantly monitored visually and promptly terminated when oil is detected in the discharge; and

(iv) the system is operated manually only until the ballast voyage is completed.

(b) A tank vessel that carries asphalt exclusively must transfer cargo residues and tank washings to a reception facility.

§ 157.39 Machinery space bilges.

(a) A tank vessel may discharge an oily mixture from a machinery space bilge that is combined with an oil cargo mixture if the vessel discharges in compliance with § 157.37.

(b) A tank vessel may discharge an oily mixture from a machinery space bilge that is not combined with an oil cargo mixture if the vessel—

(1) is more than 12 nautical miles from the nearest land;

(2) is proceeding en route;

(3) is discharging an effluent with an oil content of less than 100 parts per million; and

(4) has in operation an oil discharge monitoring and control system approved by the Coast Guard (specification regulation to be proposed) and oil water separating equipment approved by the Coast Guard (specification regulation to be proposed).

§ 157.41 Emergencies.

Sections 157.27, 157.29, 157.37, and 157.39 do not apply to a tank vessel that discharges into the sea oil or oily mixtures—

(a) for the purpose of securing the safety of the vessel or for saving life at sea; or

(b) as a result of damage to the vessel or its equipment if—

(1) reasonable precautions are taken after the occurrence of the damage or discovery of the discharge for the purpose of preventing or minimizing the discharge; and

(2) the owner, master or person in charge did not intend to cause damage, or did not act recklessly and with knowledge that damage of the environment would probably result.

§ 157.43 Discharge in port or at an offshore terminal.

The master of a tank vessel shall ensure that—

(a) segregated ballast is not discharged in a port or at an offshore terminal unless he finds no oily mixture in the ballast after—

(1) visually examining the top of the ballast contents of each tank; or

(2) testing the ballast contents of each tank with an oil/water interface detector; and

(b) clean ballast is discharged in accordance with the requirement in § 157.37(a) (6).

§ 157.45 Valves in cargo or ballast piping system.

When a tank vessel is at sea and the tanks contain oil, valves and closing devices in the cargo or ballast piping system or in the transfer system must be kept closed except they may be opened for cargo or ballast transfer to trim the vessel.

§ 157.47 Information for master.

A master or person in charge of a tank vessel shall operate the vessel in accordance with the information required in 46 CFR 31.10-30(d) that includes:

(a) Stability information.

(b) Damage stability information determined in accordance with the criteria contained in Appendix B of this part.

(c) Loading and distribution of cargo information determined in compliance with the damage stability criteria required in Appendix B of this part.

§ 157.19 Instruction manual.

The master of a tank vessel shall ensure that the instruction manual under § 157.23 is available and used when the cargo or ballast systems are operated.

APPENDIX A—DAMAGE ASSUMPTIONS, HYPOTHETICAL OUTFLOWS, AND CARGO TANK SIZE AND ARRANGEMENTS

1. Source. The procedures for the damage assumption calculations contained in this Appendix conform to Regulations 22, 23, and 24 of Annex I of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London, November 2, 1973.

2. Assumptions. For the purpose of calculating hypothetical outflow from tank vessels, three dimensions of the extent of damage of a parallelepiped on the side and bottom of the vessel are assumed.

(a) For side damage, the conditions are as follows:

Damage	Conditions
(1) Longitudinal extent (L)	$L = L_1$ or 14.5 m, whichever is less.
(2) Transverse extent (B) (inboard from the vessel's side at right angles to the centerline at the level corresponding to the assigned summer freeboard).	$B = 11.5$ m, whichever is less.
(3) Vertical extent (H)	From the base line upwards without limit.

(b) For bottom damage, two conditions to be applied individually to the stated portions of the vessel, as follows:

Damage	Conditions	
	For 0.3L from the forward perpendicular of ship	Any other part of ship
(1) Longitudinal extent (L)	$L = L_1$ or 10	$L = L_2$ or 5 meters, whichever is less.
(2) Transverse extent (B)	$B = 10$ meters, whichever is less but not less than 5 meters.	$B = 5$ meters
(3) Vertical extent from the base line (H)	$H = 6$ meters, whichever is less.	$H = 6$ meters, whichever is less.

3. Hypothetical Outflow of Oil. (a) The hypothetical outflow of oil in the case of side damage (O_s) and bottom damage (O_b) is calculated by the following formula with respect to compartments breached by damage to all conceivable locations along the length of the vessel to the extent as defined in section 2 of this Appendix.

(1) For side damages: Formula I

$$O_s = \sum W_i + \sum K_i C_i$$

(2) For bottom damage: Formula II

$$O_b = \frac{1}{3} (\sum Z_i W_i + \sum Z_i C_i)$$

Where:
 W_i = Volume of a wing tank assumed to be breached by the damage as specified in section 2 of this Appendix;
 K_i for a segregated ballast tank may be taken equal to zero;
 C_i = Volume of a center tank assumed to be breached by the damage as specified in section 2 of this Appendix;
 Z_i for a segregated ballast tank may be taken equal to zero;

$$K_i = 1 - \frac{b_i}{t_i}$$

when b_i is equal to or greater than t_i , K_i is equal to zero;

$$Z_i = 1 - \frac{h_i}{s_i}$$

when h_i is equal to or greater than s_i , Z_i is equal to zero;

b_i = Minimum width of wing tank under consideration measured inboard from the vessel's side at right angles to the centerline at the level corresponding to the assigned summer freeboard; and
 h_i = Minimum depth of the double bottom under consideration; where no double bottom is fitted, h_i is equal to zero.

(b) If a void space or segregated ballast tank of a length less than L_i is located between wing oil tanks, O_s in formula I of this section may be calculated on the basis of volume W_i being the actual volume of one such tank (where they are of equal capacity) or the smaller of the two tanks (if they differ in capacity), adjacent to such space, multiplied by S_i as defined below and taking for all other wing tanks involved in such a collision the value of the actual full volume.

$$S_i = 1 - \frac{L_i}{L_i}$$

Where L_i = length of void space or segregated ballast tank under consideration.

(c) Credit is only given in respect to double bottom tanks which are either empty or carrying clean water when cargo is carried in the tanks above.

(1) If the double bottom does not extend for the full length and width of the tank involved, the double bottom is considered nonexistent and the volume of the tanks above the area of the bottom damage must

be included in formula II of this section even if the tank is not considered breached because of the installation of such a partial double bottom.

(2) Suction wells may be neglected in the determination of the value h , if such wells are not excessive in area and extend below the tank for a minimum distance and in no case more than half the height of the double bottom. If the depth of such a well exceeds half the height of the double bottom, h is taken equal to the double bottom height minus the well height.

(d) In the case where bottom damage simultaneously involves four center tanks, the value of O , may be calculated according to formula III as follows:

$$O_c = \frac{1}{4} (\sum Z, W_i + \sum Z, C_i)$$

(e) Credit for reduced oil outflow from bottom damage may be applied to formula III for an installed emergency high suction cargo transfer system that—

(1) transfers within two hours oil equal to one half of the volume of the largest tank involved;

(2) has sufficient ballast or cargo tankage available to receive the transferred oil; and

(3) has the high suction piping installed at a height not less than the vertical extent of bottom damage (v).

4. Allowable volumes of cargo tanks.

(a) The allowable volume of a wing cargo tank (VOL_w) is equal to seventy-five percent of O_A . In a segregated ballast tank vessel VOL_w may equal O_A for a wing cargo oil tank located between two segregated ballast tanks each of length greater than l , and width greater than f .

(b) The allowable volume of a center cargo tank (VOL_c) is 50,000 cubic meters.

5. Allowable length of cargo tanks. The allowable length of a cargo tank (l) is equal to the greater of 10 meters or more of the following values:

(a) If no longitudinal bulkhead is provided, 0.1L.

(b) If a longitudinal bulkhead is provided at the centerline only, 0.15L.

(c) If two or more longitudinal bulkheads are provided:

- (i) For wing tanks, 0.2L; and
- (ii) For center tanks—

$$(i) \quad \frac{b_i}{B}$$

is equal to or greater than $\frac{1}{4}$, 0.2L; or

$$(ii) \quad \frac{b_i}{B}$$

is less than $\frac{1}{4}$; and—

(A) no centerline longitudinal bulkhead is provided,

$$\left(0.5 \frac{b_i}{B} + 0.1\right) L;$$

(B) a centerline longitudinal bulkhead is provided,

$$\left(0.25 \frac{b_i}{B} + 0.15\right) L.$$

APPENDIX B—SURVIVAL AND STABILITY ASSUMPTIONS

1. Source. The procedures for the loading assumption calculations contained in this Appendix conform to Regulation 36 of Annex I of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London, November 2, 1973.

2. Loading Assumptions. For the purpose of calculating subdivision and damage stability for a tank vessel, the operating drafts must reflect actual partial or full load conditions consistent with trim and strength of the vessel. Ballast conditions need not be

considered if the tank vessel is not carrying oil in cargo tanks excluding oily residues. Loading condition must reflect the specific gravities of the cargo.

3. Damage Assumptions.

(a) Damage is applied to all conceivable locations along the length of the vessel as follows:

(1) For a vessel of more than 225 meters in length, anywhere in the vessel's length.

(2) For a vessel of more than 150 meters, but not exceeding 225 meters in length, anywhere in the vessel's length except where the after or forward bulkhead bounding a machinery space located aft is involved in the damage assumption. The machinery space is calculated as a single floodable compartment.

(3) For a vessel 150 meters or less in length, anywhere in the vessel's length between adjacent transverse bulkheads except the machinery space.

(b) The extent and the character of the assumed side or bottom damage, as defined in section 3 of Appendix A of this part, must be applied except longitudinal bottom damage within 0.3L from the forward perpendicular must be assumed to be the same as that for side damage. If any damage of lesser extent results in a more severe condition, such damage must be assumed.

(c) If damage involves transverse bulkheads as specified in paragraphs (a) (1) and (2) of this section, transverse watertight bulkheads must be spaced at least at a distance equal to the longitudinal extent of the assumed damage specified in paragraph (b) of this section in order to be considered effective. Where transverse bulkheads are spaced at a lesser distance, one or more of these bulkheads within such extent of damage must be assumed as nonexistent for the purpose of determining flooded compartments.

(d) If the damage between adjacent transverse watertight bulkheads is within the definition contained in paragraph (a) (3) of this section, no main transverse bulkhead or a transverse bulkhead bounding side tanks or double bottom tanks is to be assumed damaged, unless—

(1) the spacing of the adjacent bulkheads is less than the longitudinal extent of assumed damage defined in paragraph (b) of this section; or

(2) there is a step or a recess in a transverse bulkhead of more than 3.05 meters in length, located within the extent of penetrations of assumed damage. The step formed by the after peak bulkhead and after peak tank top is not regarded as a step for these calculations.

(e) If pipes, ducts, or tunnels are situated within the assumed extent of damage, there must be arrangements so that progressive flooding may not thereby extend to compartments other than those assumed to be floodable for each case of damage.

4. Characteristic and Condition Assumption for Calculations.

(a) Account must be taken of any empty or partially filled tanks, the specific gravity of cargoes carried, and any outflow of liquids from damaged compartments.

(b) The permeabilities are assumed as follows:

Intended space use:	Permeability
Stores	0.00
Accommodation	0.05
Machinery	0.05
Void	0.05
Consumable liquids	* 0 or 0.05
Other liquids	* 0 or 0.05

* Whichever results in the more severe requirements.

* The permeability of partially filled compartments must be consistent with actual density and the amount of liquid carried.

(c) The buoyancy of any superstructure directly above the side damage is to be disregarded. The unflooded parts of superstructure beyond the extent of damage may be taken into consideration if they are separated from the damaged space by watertight bulkheads and no progressive flooding of these intact spaces takes place. Class I doors are allowed in watertight bulkheads in the superstructure.

(d) The free surface effect is to be calculated—

(1) at an angle of heel of 5 degrees for each individual compartment; or

(2) by assessing the shift of liquids by moment of transference calculations.

(e) In calculating the effect of free surfaces of consumable liquids, it is to be assumed that, for each type of liquid, at least one transverse pair or a single centerline tank has a free surface and the tank or combination of tanks to be taken into account is to be those where the effect of free surface is the greatest.

(R.S. 4417a(3) and (7), as amended (46 U.S.C. 391a(3) and (7); 49 CFR 1.46(n)(4) (40 CFR 3906).

Effective date. These regulations shall become effective on October 14, 1975.

Dated: October 8, 1975.

O. W. SILER,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Commandant.

[FR Doc. 75-27230 Filed 10-10-75; 8:45 am]

Title 46—Shipping
CHAPTER I—COAST GUARD,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
[CGD 74-33C]
SUBCHAPTER D—TANK VESSELS
SUBCHAPTER E—LOAD LINES
PART 42—DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN
VOYAGES BY SEA
SUBCHAPTER O—CERTAIN BULK DANGEROUS
CARGOES
TANK VESSELS CARRYING OIL IN
DOMESTIC TRADE

• Purpose. The purpose of these amendments to the regulations concerning certain seagoing U.S. tank ships and barges that carry oil in the United States domestic trade is to add references regarding the design and operation requirements that are published in 33 CFR Part 157. •

On page 48280 of this issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER, the Coast Guard promulgates amendments to Chapter I of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations. These amendments include the revision of § 161.35 (c) and (d) (2), and the addition of Part 157—Rules and Regulations for Protection of the Marine Environment Relating to Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade.

Since Part 157 contains additional design, equipment, and operation requirements for certain tank ships, a note is added to Subchapters D and O directing the reader to those additional requirements.

Titles 33 and 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations contain damage stability standards for tank vessels. The damage stability standard in 46 CFR Subpart 42.20 is derived from the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966 (18 UST 1857, TIAS 6331, 640 UNTS 133). The

RULES AND REGULATIONS

standard contained in 33 CFR § 157.21 is derived from the unratified International Convention for Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973. The purpose of the standards in both Conventions and the regulations is to keep a vessel, which suffers damage, afloat. The Coast Guard considers it an unnecessary burden on a designer to submit two sets of calculations for approval. Therefore, vessels that meet the requirements in 33 CFR 157.21 will be considered as an equivalent to meeting the subdivision and damage stability requirements of 46 CFR 42.20-5. Since § 157.21 reflects this ruling, the current amendment to § 42.20-5 will also reflect this ruling.

Since the amendments in this document are merely editorial changes, notice of proposed rule making is considered

unnecessary and they may be made effective on October 14, 1975.

In consideration of the foregoing, chapter I of Title 46, Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

1. Subchapters D and O are amended by inserting notes below the headings in the table of contents as follows:

NOTE: 33 CFR Part 157 contains additional design, equipment, and operation requirements for certain seagoing U.S. tank ships and barges that carry oil in the United States domestic trade.

2. Section 42.20-5 is amended by adding a new paragraph (a-1) to read as follows:

§ 42.20-5 Type "A" vessels.

(a-1) A vessel that meets the requirements in 33 CFR 157.21 is considered by the Coast Guard as meeting the requirements in this section.

(R.S. 4405, as amended (46 U.S.C. 375); R.S. 462, as amended (46 U.S.C. 416), sec 6(b) (1); 80 Stat. 937 (49 U.S.C. 1655(b) (1)); 49 CFR 1.46(b)).

Effective date. These amendments shall become effective on October 14, 1975.

Dated: October 6, 1975.

O. W. SILER,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard
Commandant.

[FR Doc 75-27228 Filed 10-10-75; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATIONCoast Guard
[33 CFR Part 157]
[CGD 75-201]TANK VESSELS CARRYING OIL IN
DOMESTIC TRADEProposed Amendment to Regulations for
Protection of the Marine Environment

• Purpose. The Coast Guard is considering amending the oil pollution regulations by adding requirements for the distribution of required segregated ballast in certain seagoing U.S. tankships and barges certified to carry oil in the domestic U.S. trade. •

Written comments. Interested persons are invited to participate in the proposed rulemaking by submitting written views, data, arguments, objections, and comments to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council (G-CMC/82), Room 8234, U.S. Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. 20590. Each person submitting comments should include his name and address, identify this notice (CGD 75-201), and give reasons for any recommendation. Comments received will be available for examination by interested persons in Room 8234, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

No hearing is contemplated at this time on this proposal since substantive comments were received at public hearings held in Seattle, Washington, and Washington, D.C. in July 1974 on the proposed Interim Rules and Regulations for Protection of the Marine Environment relating to Tank Vessels Carrying Oil in Domestic Trade that appeared in the June 28, 1974, issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 24150). A public hearing may be held at a time and place set in a later notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER if requested by an interested person raising a genuine issue and desiring an opportunity to comment orally at a public hearing.

Closing date for comments. All communications received before November 13, 1975 will be evaluated before final action is taken on this proposal. Furthermore, all relative written comments submitted in response to the advance notice of proposed rulemaking concerning standards for pollution abatement for new tankships constructed for trade on the navigable waters of the United States, published in the January 26, 1973 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 F.R. 2467) and the proposed Interim Rules and Regulations for Protection of the Marine Environment Relating to Tank Vessels Engaged in Domestic Trade will be considered. Those proposed regulations may be changed in light of the comments received.

The Coast Guard is publishing final rules on the design, equipment, and operation requirements for seagoing U.S. tank vessels carrying oil in domestic trade on page 48280 of this issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER. Many comments on the proposed rules were critical of the absence of a double bottom requirement.

Other commenters noted that if segregated ballast space was required to control operational pollution, a secondary use of the segregated ballast tanks to serve as protective spaces in event of collision, ramming, or grounding accidents appeared to be a beneficial and logical extension of the regulations.

The concept of distributing required segregated ballast spaces as defensive space has been under discussion nationally and internationally since at least 1971. Briefly reviewing the background of this proposal, the Coast Guard in the January 26, 1973, advance notice of proposed rulemaking requested comments on the concept of placing segregated ballast in double bottom tanks. Later, in October 1973, the International Conference on Marine Pollution, 1973, was unable to agree upon double bottoms as the required arrangement of segregated ballast. In fact, no rules for the distribution were specified in the resulting International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973.

The U.S. position favoring double bottoms was founded on two years (1969 and 1970) of worldwide spill data which seemed to indicate a heavy preponderance of spillage due to bottom damaging accidents. An additional three years (1971-1973) of spill data is now available which, when combined with the earlier data, refutes the original position. The combined data reveals that side damaging accidents are as much a problem as the bottom damaging ones, both with respect to frequency of occurrence and amounts spilled.

As a check on the validity of these figures for worldwide accidents, information on incidents occurring within 50 miles of the U.S. coastline was developed for the same years. The correlation between the data is good in the area of frequency of incidents and relative outflow by accident type. Other regional studies by the United Kingdom and Finland also confirm the validity of the statistics, thus indicating the desirability of a more general and flexible solution than simply requiring double bottoms.

Certain known statistical factors about casualties in U.S. waters must be kept in mind. Since collisions and groundings are statistically comparable hazards, it is desirable in determining vessel design to optimize the distribution of required segregated ballast space as protection against both hazards as fully as possible. The surrounding physical characteristics of a port area have a great deal to do with accident types to be anticipated. Where channels are wide and the water deep, collisions would be expected to dominate. Where water is shallow with respect to using vessel drafts, groundings should be expected. There is a wide diversity of conditions encountered in U.S. ports and even within individual port areas. It is known that most accidents to tankers do not involve breaching of the hull. Likewise, a small number of accidents involve such high energy levels that no reasonable combination of construction features would be effective.

There are a great number of variables in designing a complex mechanism like a tank vessel. The designer, in making decisions among conflicting variables, is forced to seek an optimum rather than a maximum value for each variable. This optimization means that some very desirable characteristics must be reduced from the most desirable state to a less desirable state in order to accommodate other conflicting characteristics. The Coast Guard must be certain in specifying mandatory distribution of segregated ballast space for environmental protection that the safety of the vessel is not significantly lessened.

The distribution of segregated ballast spaces cannot be dictated solely by environmental protection considerations. Longitudinal strength, damage stability, safety with respect to fires and explosions, personnel safety, and the fostering of sound operating practice, as well as the mitigation of oil outflow must also be taken into account.

In order to better assess the question of proper arrangement of segregated ballast tanks, the Coast Guard solicited the aid of a number of knowledgeable naval architects and operating personnel, which was constituted by the American Petroleum Institute as a task group, to address solely the problem of optimum distribution of required segregated ballast space taking into account all of the factors set forth in the preceding paragraph. The task group found some distributions of segregated ballast or design configurations that were superior to other configurations in mitigating outflow; however, they were also convinced that environmental protection could not be the sole factor examined in determining the safe and appropriate distribution of segregated ballast spaces. The text of the report of the task group more fully discusses the study, the methods used, and the results and conclusions of the group. This report appeared as an appendix to the final environmental impact statement, "Regulations for Tank Vessels Engaged in Carriage of Oil in Domestic Trade," which was made available to the public and the President's Council on Environmental Quality on August 15, 1975. This statement is available upon request from the Executive Secretary (G-CMC/82), U.S. Coast Guard, Washington, D.C. 20590.

The Coast Guard carefully monitored the progress and work of the task group. Independent audits of the study by Mr. George C. Nickum, President of Nickum and Spaulding Associates, Inc., Seattle, Washington, and a member of the National Academy of Engineering; W. D. Gaither, Dean of the University of Delaware's College of Marine Studies, and Professor H. Benford, Professor of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering, University of Michigan, have, without exception, found the study methodology sound and the results valid.

In view of the foregoing, the Coast Guard is proposing regulations which the study found would require the better design arrangements and rule out those design configurations found of little benefit.

PROPOSED RULES

Among the acceptable arrangements of segregated ballast under the proposed regulations are any one of the following:

- 1. Double bottoms.
- 2. Double sides.
- 3. "L" shaped wing tanks.
- 4. "J" shaped wing tanks.
- 5. Double hull.
- 6. Staggered wing tanks combined with reduced volume of intervening cargo tanks.

Specifically, it is proposed to revise § 157.09(d) to publish the standards upon which the Coast Guard would evaluate the adequacy of a tanker's distribution of required segregated ballast space. It is also proposed to add a new Appendix C to Part 157 which contains the formula for calculating the mixture of protected shell area and, if needed, the reduced hypothetical oil outflows. The new paragraph (d) is considered an interpretative rule of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973. The requirements in paragraph (d) will be applicable to new vessels contracted for after the effective date of final rules, with no limitation on delivery date. To do otherwise would penalize owners who enter into contracts for new vessels to be constructed in compliance with current regulations.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend Chapter 1 of Title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

1. Section 157.08 is amended by adding paragraph (a) (4) to read as follows:

§ 157.08 Applicability.

- (a)
- (4) The requirements in § 157.09(d) do not apply to vessels constructed under a contract awarded before

2. Section 157.09(d) is revised to read as follows:

§ 157.09 Segregated ballast.

(d) Segregated ballast spaces within the cargo tank area must be distributed—

- (1) Adjacent to the bottom and sides of the vessel; and
- (2) To meet Appendix C of this part.

3. Section 157.24 is amended by adding new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 157.24 Submission of calculations, plans, and specifications.

(c) Calculations to substantiate compliance with the segregated ballast distribution requirements in § 157.09(d).

$$\sum P.A. + \sum P.A. = 0.65 \left(\frac{O}{O_A} \right) L(2D) + 0.15 \left(\frac{O}{O_A} \right) (L)(B)$$

Where:

P.A. The sum of both port and starboard side shell area where cargo is separated from side shell by a distance of at least 1.5 meters based upon projected molded dimensions.

P.A. Bottom shell area where cargo is separated from bottom shell by a distance of at least two meters based upon projected molded dimensions.

L The length from the collision bulkhead to the forward bulkhead of the machinery space.

D Molded depth of the vessel.

O, O_A Hypothetical values as defined by § 157.19(b).

B Molded breadth as defined in § 157.03(c).

4. Part 157 is amended by adding new Appendix C, to follow Appendix B, to read as follows:

APPENDIX C—CRITERIA FOR DISTRIBUTION OF SEGREGATED BALLAST SPACES

1. Source. The criteria in this appendix interprets, constructively, the requirements of Regulation 13 of Annex I of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London November 2, 1973.

2. Formula.

(a) The distribution of segregated ballast spaces for a new vessel of conventional form, that is, those having a block coefficient of 20 or greater, a length to depth ratio between 12 and 16, and a breadth to depth ratio between 1.5 and 3.5 must meet the following formula:

(b) A new vessel of unconventional form, that is, those whose parameters fall outside the values in paragraph (a) of this Appendix, must provide a level of protection equivalent to the level of protection afforded conventional vessels by paragraph (a) of this Appendix.

(RS 4417a (3) and (7), as amended (46 U.S.C. 391a (3) and (7)); 49 CFR 1.46(n) (4)).

Dated: October 6, 1975.

W. M. BENKERT,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard
Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety.

[FR Doc.75-27229 Filed 10-10-75; 8 45 am]

APPENDIX II

**Maneuvering Characteristics,
Miscellaneous Amendments**

(40 FR 2689-2690)

FEDERAL REGISTER REPRINT

NO. 1 - 75

federal register

Area Code 202

Phone 523-5240

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1975

WASHINGTON, D.C.
Volume 40 ■ Number 10

PAGE 2689-2690

RULES AND REGULATIONS



Title 46—Shipping

**CHAPTER I—COAST GUARD,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

[CGD 73-78]

MANEUVERING CHARACTERISTICS

Miscellaneous Amendments

These amendments require ocean and coastwise vessels of 1,600 gross tons or over to carry maneuvering information in their pilothouses. These requirements were proposed in the July 20, 1973 FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 19411).

Comments were received which suggested certain changes for the purpose of clarifying conditions specified in the information requirements. In response to these comments, the following changes have been made:

Calm weather has been defined as wind 10 knots or less with a calm sea.

Deep water has been defined as water depth twice the vessel's draft or greater.

The means of obtaining the information appearing on the preliminary fact sheet required prior to certification has been clarified. The information may be obtained by trial trip observations, model tests, analytical calculations, simulations, information established from another vessel of similar hull form, power, rudder and propeller, or any combination of the foregoing.

The accuracy requirement has been limited to what is attainable by ordinary shipboard equipment.

One commentator pointed out that full and half speeds were not fully defined by the proposed rule. Since these will be stated on the fact sheet in terms of RPM or control settings, further definition is not necessary.

Another commentator felt that the data was too extensive and refined and should be reduced to a single set of the most adverse conditions.

The intent of the regulations is to provide sufficient information for a conning officer, whether ship's personnel or a just boarded pilot, to use as guidelines for handling the vessel under varying conditions.

One comment was that highly specialized craft should be excluded from the rules or that there should be a specific provision for an exemption from the rules.

A section has been added which provides that specialized craft such as semi-submersible drilling units, hydrofoils, hovercraft and other vessels of unusual design will be dealt with individually.

In consideration of the foregoing, Chapter I of Title 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations is hereby amended as follows:

PART 35—OPERATIONS

1. By adding a new section after § 35.20-35:

§ 35.20-40 Maneuvering Characteristics—T/OC.

For each ocean and coastwise tankship of 1,600 gross tons or over, the following apply:

(a) The following maneuvering information must be prominently displayed in the pilothouse on a fact sheet:

SDL (No. 100)

A: acdefhijklmnopqrsuv (1)

B: bce(3), gj(2), dhpq(1)

C: o(6), g(3), dklm(1)

D: bdfk(1)

E: ao(4)

F: k(25), b(5), cmp(1)

List - CG-10

(1)

8

RULES AND REGULATIONS

(1) For full and half speed, a turning circle diagram to port and starboard that shows the time and the distance of advance and transfer required to alter the course 90 degrees with maximum rudder angle and constant power settings.

(2) The time and distance to stop the vessel from full and half speed while maintaining approximately the initial heading with minimum application of rudder.

(3) For each vessel with a fixed propeller, a table of shaft revolutions per minute for a representative range of speeds.

(4) For each vessel with a controllable pitch propeller a table of control settings for a representative range of speeds.

(5) For each vessel that is fitted with an auxiliary device to assist in maneuvering, such as a bow thruster, a table of vessel speeds at which the auxiliary device is effective in maneuvering the vessel.

(b) The maneuvering information must be provided for the normal load and normal ballast condition for—

(1) Calm weather—wind 10 knots or less, calm sea;

(2) No current;

(3) Deep water conditions—water depth twice the vessel's draft or greater; and

(4) Clean hull.

(c) At the bottom of the fact sheet, the following statement must appear:

WARNING

The response of the (name of the vessel) may be different from those listed above if any of the following conditions, upon which the maneuvering information is based, are varied:

(1) Calm weather—wind 10 knots or less, calm sea;

(2) No current;

(3) Water depth twice the vessel's draft or greater;

(4) Clean hull; and

(5) Intermediate drafts or unusual trim.

(d) The information on the fact sheet must be:

(1) Verified six months after the vessel is placed in service; or

(2) Modified six months after the vessel is placed into service and verified within three months thereafter.

(e) The information that appears on the fact sheet may be obtained from:

(1) Trial trip observations;

(2) Model tests;

(3) Analytical calculations;

(4) Simulations;

(5) Information established from another vessel of similar hull form, power, rudder and propeller; or

(6) Any combination of the above.

The accuracy of the information in the fact sheet required is that attainable by ordinary shipboard navigation equipment.

(f) The requirements for information for fact sheets for specialized craft such as semi-submersibles, hydrofoils, hovercraft and other vessels of unusual design will be specified on a case by case basis.

PART 78—OPERATIONS

PART 97—OPERATIONS

PART 196—OPERATIONS

2. By amending Parts 78, 97, and 196 by adding Subparts 78.21, 97.19, and 196.19, headed "Maneuvering Characteristics" and consisting of §§ 78.21-1, 97.19-1, and 196.19-1 respectively, that read similar to § 35.20-40, except the heading of each section would read "Data required", and the introductory text of the sections and of paragraph (b) would read as follows:

For each ocean and coastwise vessel of 1,600 gross tons or over, the following apply:

(b) The maneuvering information must be provided in the normal load and normal light condition with normal trim for a particular condition of loading assuming the following—

(R.S. 4405, as amended, R.S. 4417a, as amended, R.S. 4462, as amended, sec. 6(b)(1), 80 Stat. 937; U.S.C. 375, 391a, 416, 49 U.S.C. 1655 (b)(1); 49 CFR 1.46(b)) and (c)(4))

Effective date. These amendments become effective on February 14, 1975.

Dated: January 6, 1975.

E. L. PERRY,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Acting Commandant.

[FR Doc.75-1343 Filed 1-14-75; 8:45 am]

APPENDIX III

**Vessel Inspection Regulations,
Proposed Rulemaking**

(40 FR 42751-42754)



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

MAILING ADDRESS
U.S. COAST GUARD (G-CMC/82)
400 SEVENTH STREET SW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590
PHONE 202 426 1477

proposed rules

5991/2
18 September 1975
Serial 14-P-75

Interested persons are invited to participate in this rulemaking by submitting written data, views, or arguments to the Executive Secretary, Marine Safety Council, U. S. Coast Guard (G-CMC/82), Washington D.C. 20590, prior to October 31, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

[46 CFR Parts 32, 35, 77, 78, 96, 167, 184,
185, 195, 196]

[CGD 75-074]

VESSEL INSPECTION REGULATIONS
Proposed Rulemaking

The purpose of these amendments to the vessel inspection regulations is to publish within the Code of Federal Regulations amendments to the Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1960.

The assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) at its fourth extraordinary session held in London, November 1968, adopted three amendments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960. These amendments were an outgrowth of a study by IMCO of the disastrous TORREY CANYON foundering on 18 March 1967. The amendments will require vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean and coastwise service to be fitted with a radar, radio direction finding apparatus, gyro compass, and echo sounding device. Conditions of vessel operation while under the control of an automatic pilot are also specified. In addition to the specific navigational equipment requirements for vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over, all ships subject to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, must carry adequate and up-to-date charts, sailing directions, lists of lights, notices to mariners, tide tables and other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

The United States Delegation to IMCO consulted with the American maritime industry, interested agencies of the Executive Branch of the United States Government and other interested parties concerning the 1968 amendments in preparation for all stages of IMCO consideration. The Coast Guard is not aware of

any objections to any of the amendments as they were adopted by the assembly. The impact on United States merchant vessels will not be great because nearly all of our vessels of the tonnage indicated have the required equipment on board at the present time.

Eight additional amendments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, were adopted in London, October 1969. Of the eight amendments, only two have any impact on United States vessels. The first requires that the two firemen's outfits that are presently carried be stored conveniently for use in widely separated accessible locations. The second requires that the International Code of Signals be carried on board vessels which must be provided with radiotelegraph or radiotelephone installations.

Interested persons may participate in this proposed rule making by submitting written data, views, or arguments to the Coast Guard (G-CMC), 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Each person submitting a comment should include his name and address, identify the notice (CGD 75-074) and give reasons for any recommendations. Comments received before October 31, 1975, will be available in Room 8234, Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, D.C. The proposal may be held at a time and place set in a later changed in light of comments received. No hearing is contemplated but may be requested by an interested person desiring an opportunity to comment orally at a public hearing and raising a genuine issue.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend Chapter I of Title 46, of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 32—SPECIAL EQUIPMENT
MACHINERY AND HULL REQUIREMENTS

§ 32.15-10 [Amended]

1. Section 32.15-10 is amended by de-

leting the words "mechanical or" in the first sentence.

2. By adding a new sentence to § 32.15-20(a) to read as follows:

§ 32.15-20 Radiotelegraph and Radiotelephone—T/ALL.

(a) * * * All vessels engaged on an international voyage which are required to carry a radiotelegraph or radiotelephone in accordance with Chapter IV of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 1960 must carry the International Code of Signals.

3. By adding a new § 32.15-30 to read as follows:

§ 32.15-30 Radar—T/OC.

All tankships of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a radar. Details of the application of these requirements, as well as the details of the installations, must comply with the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. Facilities for plotting radar readings must be provided on the bridge.

4. By adding a new § 32.15-35 to read as follows:

§ 32.15-35 Magnetic and Gyro Compass T/OC.

(a) All tankships in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a magnetic compass.

(b) All tankships of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a gyro compass in addition to the magnetic compass.

SDL (No. 101)

A: acdefghijklmnopqrsuv(1)

B: bce(3), gj(2), dhpq(1)

C: o(6), g(3), dklm(1)

D: bdfk(1)

E: ao(4)

F: k(25), b(5), cmp (1)

List: CG-10

CG-26

PROPOSED RULES

PART 35—OPERATIONS

5. By revising § 35.20-1(d) to read as follows:

§ 35.20-1 Notice to Mariners, Aids to Navigation—T/OCLB.

(d) All vessels must carry adequate and up-to-date—

- (1) Charts,
- (2) Sailing directions,
- (3) Coast pilots,
- (4) Light list,
- (5) Notices to mariners,
- (6) Tide tables,
- (7) Current tables, and
- (8) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

6. By adding § 35.20-45 to read as follows:

§ 35.20-45 Use of Auto Pilot T/ALL.

(a) When the automatic pilot is used in—

- (1) Areas of high traffic density,
- (2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and

(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the master shall ensure that—

(i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering.

(ii) A qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and

(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the officer of the watch.

7. By revising the first sentence of § 35.30-20 to read as follows:

§ 35.30-20 Emergency Equipment—T/ALL.

(a) Two emergency outfits that are stored conveniently for use in widely separated accessible locations are required for the following: . . .

PART 77—VESSEL CONTROL AND MISCELLANEOUS SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

8. By adding a new Subpart 77.09 to read as follows:

Subpart 77.09—Radar

§ 77.09-1 When required.

(a) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a radar. Details of the application of these requirements, as well as the details of the installations, must comply with the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. Facilities for plotting radar readings must be provided on the bridge.

9. By adding a new Subpart 77.11 to read as follows:

Subpart 77.11—Magnetic and Gyro Compass

§ 77.11-1 When required.

(a) All vessels in ocean, coastwise or Great Lakes service must be fitted with a magnetic compass.

(b) All vessels 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a gyro compass, in addition to the magnetic compass.

10. By adding a new paragraph (b) to § 77.13-1 to read as follows:

Subpart 77.13—Radiotelegraph and Radiotelephone

§ 77.13-1 Required by Federal Communications Commission.

(b) All vessels engaged on an international voyage which are required to carry a radiotelegraph or radiotelephone installation in accordance with Chapter IV of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 1960 must carry the International Code of Signals.

§ 77.27-1 [Amended]

11. Section 77.27-1 is amended by deleting the words "mechanical or" from the first sentence.

PART 78—OPERATIONS

12. By revising § 78.05-5 to read as follows:

§ 78.05-5 Charts and Nautical Publications.

(a) All vessels except barges, ferry boats and vessels operating exclusively on rivers, must carry adequate and up-to-date—

- (1) Charts,
- (2) Sailing directions,
- (3) Coast pilots,
- (4) Light list,
- (5) Notices to mariners,
- (6) Tide tables,
- (7) Current tables, and
- (8) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

13. By adding a new Subpart 78.19 to read as follows:

Subpart 78.19—Auto Pilot

§ 78.19-1 Use of Auto Pilot.

(a) When the automatic pilot is used in—

- (1) Areas of high traffic density,
- (2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and

(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the master shall ensure that—

(i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering.

(ii) A qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and

(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the officer of the watch.

PART 96—VESSEL CONTROL AND MISCELLANEOUS SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

14. By adding a new paragraph (b) to § 96.13-1 to read as follows:

Subpart 96.13—Radiotelegraph and Radiotelephone

§ 96.13-1 Required by Federal Communications Commission.

(b) All vessels engaged on an international voyage which are required to carry a radiotelegraph or radiotelephone installation in accordance with Chapter IV of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 1960 must carry the International Code of Signals.

15. By adding a new Subpart 96.17 to read as follows:

Subpart 96.17—Magnetic and Gyro Compass

§ 96.17-1 When required.

(a) All vessels in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a magnetic compass.

(b) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a gyro compass in addition to the magnetic compass.

16. By adding a new Subpart 96.25 to read as follows:

Subpart 96.25—Radar

§ 96.25-1 When required.

(a) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a radar. Details of the application of these requirements, as well as the details of the installations, must comply with the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. Facilities for plotting radar readings must be provided on the bridge.

§ 96.27-1 [Amended]

17. Section 96.27-1 is amended by deleting the words "mechanical or" in the first sentence of paragraph (a).

18. By revising paragraph (a) of § 96.35-15 to read as follows:

§ 96.35-15 Stowage.

(a) The fireman's outfits and personal equipment must be stored convenient for use in widely separated accessible locations.

PART 97—OPERATIONS

19. By revising § 97.05-5(a) to read as follows:

§ 97.05-5 Charts and Nautical Publications.

(a) All vessels except barges, vessels operating exclusively on rivers, and motorboats other than those certified for ocean or coastwise routes, must carry adequate and up-to-date—

- (1) Charts,
- (2) Sailing directions,
- (3) Coast pilots,
- (4) Light list,
- (5) Notices to mariners,
- (6) Tide tables,
- (7) Current tables, and
- (8) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

20. By adding a new Subpart 97.16 to read as follows:

PROPOSED RULES

Subpart 97.16—Auto Pilot

§ 97.16-1 Use of Auto Pilot.

- (a) When the automatic pilot is used in—
(1) Areas of high traffic density.
(2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and
(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the master shall ensure that—
(i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering.
(ii) A qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and
(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the officer of the watch.

PART 167—PUBLIC NAUTICAL SCHOOL SHIPS

§ 167.40-20 [Amended]

- 21. Section 167.40-20 is amended by deleting the words "mechanical or" from the first and second sentences.
22. By adding a new § 167.40-40 to read as follows:

§ 167.40-10 Radar.

- (a) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a radar. Details of the application of these requirements, as well as the details of the installations, must comply with the regulations under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission. Facilities for plotting radar readings must be provided on the bridge.

23. By adding a new § 167.40-45 to read as follows:

§ 167.40-45 Magnetic and Gyro Compass.

- (a) All vessels in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a magnetic compass.
(b) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a gyro compass in addition to the magnetic compass.

24. By adding a new § 167.65-35 to read as follows:

§ 167.65-35 Use of Auto Pilot.

- (a) When the automatic pilot is used in—
(1) Areas of high traffic density.
(2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and
(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the master shall ensure that—
(i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering.
(ii) A qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and
(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the officer of the watch.

25. By revising § 167.65-45(d) to read as follows:

§ 167.65-45 Charts and Nautical Publications.

- (d) All nautical school ships must carry adequate and up-to-date—
(1) Charts.
(2) Sailing directions.
(3) Coast pilots.
(4) Light list.
(5) Notices to mariners.
(6) Tide tables, and
(7) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

PART 184—VESSEL CONTROL AND MISCELLANEOUS SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

26. By adding a new paragraph (c) to § 184.25-1 to read as follows:

Subpart 184.25—Radio

§ 184.25-1 Requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.

- (c) All vessels engaged on an international voyage which are required to carry a radiotelegraph or radiotelephone installation in accordance with Chapter IV of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention 1960, must carry the International Code of Signals.

PART 185—OPERATIONS

27. By adding a new § 185.20-30 to read as follows:

Subpart 185.20-30—Miscellaneous Operating Requirements

§ 185.20-30 Use of Auto Pilot.

- (a) When the automatic pilot is used in—
(1) Areas of high traffic density.
(2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and
(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the operator shall ensure that—
(i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering.
(ii) That a qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and
(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the operator.

28. By adding a new § 185.20-35 to read as follows:

§ 185.20-35 Charts and Nautical Publications.

- (a) All vessels engaged in an international voyage must carry adequate and up-to-date—
(1) Charts.
(2) Sailing directions.
(3) Coast pilots.
(4) Light list.
(5) Notices to mariners.
(6) Tide tables.
(7) Current tables, and
(8) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

PART 195—VESSEL CONTROL AND MISCELLANEOUS SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

29. By adding a new paragraph (b) to § 195.13-1 to read as follows:
Subpart 195.13—Radiotelegraph and Radiotelephone

§ 195.13-1 Required by Federal Communications Commission.

- (b) All vessels engaged on an international voyage which are required to carry a radiotelegraph or radiotelephone installation in accordance with Chapter IV of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, 1960 must carry the International Code of Signals.

30. By adding a new Subpart 195.17 to read as follows:

Subpart 195.17—Radar

§ 195.17 When required.

- (a) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a radar. Details of the application of these requirements, as well as the details of the installations, must comply with the regulations under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission. Facilities for plotting radar readings must be provided on the bridge.

31. By adding a new Subpart 195.19 to read as follows:

Subpart 195.19—Magnetic and Gyro Compass

§ 195.19-1 When required.

- (a) All vessels in ocean or coastwise service must be fitted with a magnetic compass.
(b) All vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over in ocean or coastwise service fitted with a gyro compass in addition to the magnetic compass.

§ 195.21-1 [Amended]

32. Section 195.27-1 is amended by deleting the words "mechanical or" in the first sentence.

33. By adding a new sentence to § 195.35-10(b) to read as follows:

§ 195.35-10 Firemen's Outfit.

- (b) . . . The firemen's outfits and personal equipment must be stored convenient for use in widely separated accessible locations.

PART 196—OPERATIONS

34. By revising § 196.05-5 to read as follows:

§ 196.05-5 Charts and Nautical Publications.

All vessels except barges, ferry boats, and vessels operating exclusively on rivers must carry adequate and up-to-date—

- (a) Charts.
(b) Sailing directions.
(c) Coast pilots.
(d) List of lights.
(e) Notices to mariners.
(f) Tide tables.
(g) Current tables, and
(h) All other nautical publications necessary for the intended voyage.

PROPOSED RULES

35. By adding a new Subpart 196.16 to read as follows:

Subpart 196.16—Auto Pilot

§ 196.16-1 Use of Auto Pilot.

(a) When the automatic pilot is used in—

- (1) Areas of high traffic density,
- (2) Conditions of restricted visibility, and

(3) All other hazardous navigational situations, the master shall ensure that—

- (i) It is possible to establish immediately human control of a ship's steering,
- (ii) That a qualified helmsman is ready at all times to take over steering control, and

(iii) The change over from automatic to manual steering and vice versa is made by or under the supervision of the officer of the watch.

(46 U.S.C. 375, 416, 49 U.S.C. 1655(b)(1); 49 CFR 146(b)).

Dated: September 9, 1975.

W. M. BENKERT,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety.

(FR Doc. 75-24885 Filed 9-15-75 8:45 am)