

U.S. Department of
Homeland Security

United States
Coast Guard



Commander
U. S. Coast Guard
Sector Corpus Christi

Prevention Department
249 Glasson Drive
Corpus Christi, TX 78418
Phone: (361) 939-5138
Email: [REDACTED]@uscg.mil

Interview Summary

Please Print Clearly:

Name: [REDACTED]
Street Address: 249 Glasson Drive
City/State/Zip: Corpus Christi, TX 78418
Phone No: 361-939-5138
Position: Coast Guard Investigating Officer

I, the undersigned, make the following statement voluntarily, without threat, duress or promise of reward:

CWO [REDACTED] & NTSB conducted a joint interview with Mr. Yu, class surveyor on the RIVERSIDE. Representatives from Royston Razor joined representing the MODA dock, Representatives from Welder Leshin joined representing the vessels interest and Liam O'Connell joined representing the P&I club for the vessel. DMV counsel was also on the line, representing DMV. The below is my summary of the interview.

Mr. Yu has been the principal surveyor and has been with DMV for 24 years. Trained for 2 years, 96-98 within DMV. Became principal surveyor in 2010-2011. DMV has been his sole employer, but has worked with DMV in other countries, China, Norway, Dubai and then U.S.

Mr. Yu stated on average he conducts between 70-100 surveys a year.

Mr. Yu was involved notified 20 March and came onboard 21 March, Mr. Yu was told that the vessel needed to do a Sea trial and the class surveyor needed to witness the sea trial due to the main engine malfunction and subsequent repair. Mr. Yu was the second surveyor, the first surveyor that came onboard could not continue on the vessel and did not get to talk to the first surveyor prior to Mr. Yu coming onboard the RIVERSIDE.

When Mr. Yu came onboard he was asked to wait until after the CG exam to begin Sea Trials. While he waited, the crew and the CG called Mr. Yu to the engine room to examine the leaking on the #1 and #5 fuel pumps which they felt may need to be repaired prior to sea trials. They decided to allow sea trials to see how the fuel pump leaks during the sea trials.

Mr. Yu's observations were limited to the pieces of equipment that were brought to his attention. Following the sea trials, they identified the extent of the leaking, and decided the crew needed to repair the leaking prior to the vessel continuing sea trials. Class departed the vessel and came back the next day to continue sea trials. No abnormal conditions were observed on the second sea trial however, class came back to follow up on other items and they conducted a third set of sea trials following the #1 exhaust valve being overhauled, no abnormal conditions were noted.

Mr. Yu checked the maintenance records on the starting air system during the ISM audit. He did not get to see the condition of the #6 valve prior to the valve being overhauled.

During the sea trials, Mr. Yu was focused specifically on the sea trials and did not observe anything else. His scope included the damage and fixing the damage and he is not in a position to give an opinion on the overall condition of the vessel or maintenance or lack thereof.

The vessel operated off a computer based maintenance system with the history of maintenance and planned maintenance along with technician's reports. Additionally, they did have some paper copies of maintenance reports from a variety of different representative's from different manufactures.

Mr. Yu looked at the last audit as well as part of his ISM audit. When asked when he compared the previous audit and at his audit, if anything stood out to him, he stated he was just focused on the audit at hand and that he was not in a position to make a comment.

Mr. Yu wished to clarify his scope, he came onboard to witness sea trials, and was asked to witness repairs for the CG deficiencies, then conduct the external ISM audit.

Mr. Yu was asked if it was common for class to conduct the external ISM audit, he stated there was no restriction on that to his knowledge. They are all trained to do the audit and the survey.

Mr. Yu issued one non conformity for the maintenance in turbo for the main engine starting air system. Planned maintenance (overhaul) is every 2.5 years and every 5 years. However, the service maintenance of the manufacturer states the maintenance should be conducted every 2 years. The non-conformity was based on that discrepancy. The last time the overhaul was conducted was sometimes in July 21, 2019 according to their records.

During the audit, Mr. Yu normally ask general questions about maintenance and when it is scheduled, and stated it depends on the situation, when asked what questions he asked in this situation, he stated he thinks the Chief showed him the computer maintenance program. As the auditor did not have any finding for the crews knowledge of the maintenance required.

During sea trials, the vessel was able to be commanded in the ahead and the astern position with no issue. Mr. Yu did not know why the air start would work sometimes and not in other times.

During sea trials, the engine gets put in the stop, and astern position 3 times he believes.

CWO [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]