

**Connecticut Pilot Commission  
Summary Report November 16, 2010 Public Meeting  
Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound  
New Haven, CT**

1.) The public meeting was called to order at 8:41 a.m. by the Chairman. Pilot Commission members Rick Barry, Chuck Beck, Peter Boynton, Vincent Cashin, and John Love were present forming a quorum of five. Also attending was Alan Stevens and Dave Rossiter of CTDOT, LT Jud Coleman of the USCG, John Jamroga, Charlie Jonas, Keith Kelsey, Joe Maco, Alex Woodworth and Dan Coleman.

2.) A motion to approve the summary report of the September 21, 2010 meeting was made by Vin Cashin, seconded by Rick Barry and approved by unanimous vote.

3.) Continuing Business:

A. Goals and Objectives

(1) Apprentice Selection and Training Regulation - Chuck Beck stated that the Apprentice Selection and Training regulation had reviewed by the Attorney General's office and forwarded to the Legislative Review Committee on November 1<sup>st</sup>. He announced that the Regs Review Committee's next meeting is scheduled to take place the morning of Tuesday Dec 21, 2010 which is also the date and time of the next CPC meeting. All agreed to move the December 2010 meeting as to not conflict with the Regs Review Committee meeting. A new date/time will be recommended/ approved by the CPC Commissioners via e-mail. Vin Cashin asked a question about potential conflicts between the new regulation and the current statutes. Beck advised that the statute requires a federal master's license as a prerequisite and the regulation is more specific requiring a federal master's license, near coastal, any gross tons. However, the more specific requirement has been in place since 1991. In other words is not part of the sought after regulatory change. Additionally, the difference between the statute and regulation was identified in the Comments and Response to Comments document that was reviewed by the AG's office.

There was a discussion about new terms introduced in the Definition section of the proposed regulation, specifically Waters and Full Branch. Beck stated that the definition of Waters was not new. It was taken from other documents such as the MOA between the Board of Commissioners of Pilots of the State of New York and the CT Department of Transportation and merely being introduced/ codified by in the regulations for the first time. With respect to the requirement of an apprentice pilot being licensed as a Full Branch Pilot, Beck stated that the long term goal of the Department has for some time been to have all of the CT licensed pilots qualified as a Full Branch Pilot; i.e. qualified in all of the Waters as defined, as opposed to individual ports or parts of the waters of Long Island Sound. Charlie Jonas stated that New York defines Full Branch differently (gross tons and draft) vs area than CT (by area) thus could cause a conflict. Similarly, NY defines the waters by three general geographical areas (eastern, central and western Long Island Sound) as opposed to the proposed definition in the regulation. He felt that the Full Branch requirement was inappropriate given the lack of traffic in some of the areas of the Waters such as Bridgeport and the western end of LIS.

(2) Review and Discuss Goals and Objectives – No comments offered.

B. Recency Issues – Bill Gash had asked for the recency issue to be on the October CPC agenda. Recency had been discussed at the Sept 21, 2010 CPC meeting ending with the Chairman's desire to get input from the NY Board on whether or not the recency requirements should be reduced due to the lack of traffic in some areas of the Waters. Since the October meeting was cancelled due to a lack of a quorum, the topic was carried over to the November agenda. In the absence of Bill Gash, Chuck Beck summarized the issue and read an excerpt from

the Tuesday October 19, 2010 NY Board minutes. The minutes reflected that the NY Board had discussed and "voted not to change the existing recency requirements". Vin Cashin asked if Alan Blume had reported on his investigation relative to what other states used for recency requirements. Given his absence, it was decided to keep the item on the agenda for the next meeting to allow both Bill Gash and Alan Blume to weigh in. John love initiated a discussion on other means that could be pursued to meet the recency requirement. Vin Cashin stated that the CT licensed pilots had chartered a Miller Marine boat recently but it is difficult to get all of the pilots together at one time to minimize the expense.

C. Annual Report – Chuck Beck reminded all of the need to approve the 2009-2010 Annual Report due to last minute edits recommended after the vote to approve taken at the September meeting. Rick Barry moved to approve the Annual Report as written. The motion was seconded by Vin Cashin and approved by a unanimous vote.

#### 4.) New Business

A. Joint Rotation Administrator – Chuck Beck stated that Bill Gash had asked for the issue to be on the agenda. The reason stated in an e-mail was that 90% of all landings in Long Island sound took place in CT thus, perhaps the JRA should be located in CT. Due to Bill Gash's absence it was decided to defer discussion until the December meeting.

B. 2011 Meeting Schedule – Chuck Beck brought all's attention to material contained in the meeting package concerning a proposed meeting schedule for calendar year 2011. The draft schedule retained the date and time format (third Tuesday of each month at 0830) but proposed rotating the location among four different locations (Ne Haven, Old Lyme, New London and Newington). After some discussion, Rick Barry moved, Vin Cashin seconded and by unanimous vote it was approved to continue to hold meetings at 0830 at the CG Sector LIS conference room in New Haven with one meeting every quarter to be held at the CTDOT HQ building in Newington. A motion was made by Vin Cashin, seconded by Rick Barry and approved by unanimous vote to hold the meetings during 2011 on the third Tuesday of each month with a couple of exceptions: no meeting in August, and holding the meetings in February and March on the following Tuesday (Feb 22 and March 22)

C. NY Definition of Pilotage Terms – Chuck Beck introduce the topic by making reference to an e-mail dated Oct 21, 2010 from Vin Cashin to the CPC Commissioners. Cashin stated that the issues had already been covered within the discussion held in 3A(1) above.

The Chairman asked for indulgence to discuss a new item: inserting a Public Comment item on the agenda. After a short discussion, Vin Cashin made a motion to add a Public Comment item to the agenda between the CG Comments and the Executive Session starting with the current meeting. The motion was seconded by Rick Barry and approved by unanimous vote.

5. CONNDOT Comments – Chuck Beck started the discussion by reminding all that the pilot renewal packages were due to be in the hands of CTDOT by Dec 1. He stated that the Department would accept the old medical forms or the new CG-719K forms this year but only the CG-719K thereafter. In a response to a question, Beck stated that the forms were available from Dave Rossiter or on-line. Joe Maco made comments concerning some difficulty with the new forms and CG process and felt that the CG seemed to be heading towards an FAA type system. Dave Rossiter stated that there might be a need for a higher level of competency within the Department to review the new forms and draw the proper conclusions about an applicant's fitness for duty. In response to a question from Alan Stevens about possible confusion relative to reimbursements to CPC members for mileage, it was stated that the matter had been resolved by a change to the statutes.

#### 6. USCG Comments

A. LIS AMSC – LT Jud Coleman announced that the LIS Anchorage Regulation Final

Rule should be published by the end of the month (Nov). A discussion ensued concerning an apparent change after the public comment period that makes the use of the anchorage areas mandatory vs voluntary. The mandatory use by all vessels (ships and tugs and barges) could over tax the boundaries of the designated anchorage areas. Additionally forcing smaller vessels to use the anchorages could prevent them from seeking a lee elsewhere in some weather conditions. LT Coleman committed to determining how, when and for what reasons the anchorage areas were made mandatory and reporting back to the CPC at the December meeting if not sooner by e-mail. The item will be kept on the agenda for tracking purposes until resolved.

B. LIS HSC – See above

7. Public Comment – Joe Maco questioned the need/motives behind holding a discussion on the joint Rotation Administrator. He questioned the veracity of the statistics that had been offered concerning landings used to justify relocating the JRA to CT.

Charlie Jonas restated his concerns about definitions being codified in the proposed Apprentice Selection, Training and Certification Regulation. He also stated that the aforementioned statistics came from the NY Maritime Association.

8. Executive Session – Executive Session was not requested or held.

9. A motion to adjourn was made by Rick Barry, seconded by Vin Cashin and approved by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 0945.

The Commission's next public meeting is scheduled for **8:30 a.m. on Tuesday December 21, 2010 at the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound in New Haven, CT**  
However, the meeting will be held a different date, perhaps **Wednesday 22 December, 2010 as discussed in 3A(1) above**

Peter Boynton  
Chairman, Connecticut Pilot Commission