

**Connecticut Pilot Commission
Summary Report March 19, 2012 Public Meeting
Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound
New Haven, CT**

- 1.) The public meeting was called to Order at 8:32 a.m. by the Chairman, Peter Boynton. Pilot Commission members Chuck Beck, William Borek Bill Gash, Phil Gaughran and Ralph Gogliettino were also present. Alan Blume arrived a few minutes late. Also attending were Rich Astles, CDR Amy Beach, Paul Costabile, Tom Dubno, Scott Esposito, Charlie Jonas, Patrick Kennedy, Pat Kennedy, Joe Maco, Jimmy Miller, Adam Richardson, Dave Rossiter and Alex Woodworth. All present were asked to introduce themselves.

- 2.) A motion was made to approve the summary report of the February 27, 2012 meeting by Bill Gash and seconded by Phil Gaughran. There was no discussion. The motion passed with 6 affirmative votes with one abstention by Dave Pohorylo.

- 3.) Continuing Business:
 - A. Goals and Objectives –The Chairman tabled discussion until Alan Blume arrived.

 - B Apprentice Pilot Update – The Chairman asked Chuck Beck to start the discussion. Beck reminded all that at the February meeting there had been a discussion on whether or not trips made by the three selected apprentice pilots before they were selected into the apprentice training program should count towards the trips required as part of the training and certification program. Beck reminded all that the Chairman had asked for a committee of three to review the trip reports and provided some guidance: (1) can the previous rides be properly documented (and if a specific ride consisted of actual training based on the documentation) and (2) to review how the language in the Apprentice Selection and Training Regulation can be interpreted. The committee consisted of Bill Gash, Phil Gaughran and Dave Pohorylo who had met in Dave Pohorylo's office the week before. Phil Gaughran took the lead on the follow-on discussion. He presented a spreadsheet the committee had generated that showed the trips made in the MOA waters by each of the three selected apprentices. He explained that not all of the trips would count for various reasons such a ride not being a full trip. It was noted that some of the documented observer trips had not been supervised by a "senior pilot" as defined in the regulations. It was also pointed out that none of the trips had been evaluated using the CPC generated evaluation sheet. Some trips did have an evaluation sheet generated by the CSP and others generated by Northeast Pilots but others did not have any evaluation sheet tagged to a trip report. The Chairman reviewed the Apprentice Selection and Training Regulations noting that the CPC was tasked with collecting evaluations and then forwarding them to the CTDOT Commissioner with a recommendation. The Chairman asked the committee to adjust the spreadsheet based on the above discussion of what should be included/eliminated. He also asked the committee to provide any and all documentation related to the summary report such as Trip Observer reports and completed evaluation forms. Lastly the Chairman asked the committee to draft a letter on behalf of the CPC that would forward a recommendation to the CTDOT Commissioner. Dave Pohorylo asked once the task is completed would there be additional people being trained in advance of being accepted into the apprentice selection and training program set forth in the regulations. Phil Gaughran stated no. Alan Blume caused against such a direct response. Blume reminded all that the CTDOT initiate the apprentice selection process only after a need is expressed by the pilots. The need for an apprentice can be determined in advance but might also be the result of an unexpected change in the number of licensed pilots. Chuck Beck agreed with Blume's caution pointing out that one of the members of the public (Adam Richardson) had introduced himself as an apprentice to Interport Pilots, which is outside of the codified apprentice selection process. The Chairman commented that it was the responsibility of the pilot organization to be ready to meet personnel needs. He further stated that changes to the regulations might be in order to clarify which trips should/should not count towards the training program keeping in mind that the goal is safety of navigation through standards of training.

Charlie Jonas clarified that the Richardson was being trained to obtain his federal license. So any trips he is currently making would not count towards the state requirement. Joe Maco cautioned against making small changes to the newly created regulation in that it would open a can of worms as related to people who might have previously held a state license in the past. Chuck Beck stated that re-activating an inactivated license was already covered by the statutes and regulations part from the apprentice program. The Chairman repeated the tasking to the committee. Bill Gash moved that the committee would remove the non-senior pilot supervised rides from the summary spreadsheet, would forward the corrected data to the Chairman and would provide the Chairman with a draft letter to forward the information to the CTDOT with a recommendation. The Chairman asked that the motion be amended to have the information and letter sent to the CPC to be signed by the Chairman. He also reminded the committee that three points needed to be addressed: 1. the trips in questioned preceded the regulations 2. identify the trips supported by evaluation forms. 3. ask that documented trips be counted towards the apprentice training requirement and why. The amended motion was seconded by Dave Pohoylo. Additional discussion touched upon the need to have all of the documentation presented as an attachment to the letter, to be clear on whether the trips took place before the regulations took effect or before the apprentices were selected for the training program and consideration should be given to eliminating any trip reports that did not have an accompanying evaluation form to make the argument stronger. Joe Maco inquired as to whether or not the information would be made available to the public. Chuck Beck stated that the practice was to include letters signed by the Chairman on behalf of the CPC in the appropriate meeting package which gets distributed to all on the CPC e-mail bang listed. Alex Woodworth asked if the evaluation forms submitted as part of the apprentice application packages could be included in the review. Chuck Beck stated if acceptable he would review the packages, scan the appropriate documents and provide them via e-mail to the committee. All agreed. The Chairman set a two week timeline for the collection and review of the documentation and preparation of the summary and draft letter. With the amended motion on the table a vote was called. The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

C Pilotage Rates and Fees – Chuck Beck reminded all that at the February meeting the Chairman as the pilots to address the points contained in the CTDOT letter dated Feb 7, 2012. Phil Gaughran stated that a reply to CTDOT with the information requested had been sent that morning but he did not have a copy. Chuck Beck asked if the original rate increase request letter had ever been addressed and sent to the NY Board. Paul Costabile inquired about the letter of reply and why it had not been shared with the RSEB before sending. He added that at the last two RSEB letters the NY side of the Executive Board had made it clear that sharing such information in advance was key to working together for common purposes. The Chairman decided to table further discussion in the absence of a copy the CPC letter of reply to CTDOT letter. Charlie /Jonas added that the rate request letter had been sent to the NY Board already. The Chairman asked if he could provide a copy. Jonas replied that he already has as it's the same letter sent to the CPC but would provide a copy to Chuck Beck.

The Chairman returned to agenda item 3A Goals and Objectives. Alan Blume noted that several items on the original Goals and Objectives list had been accomplished. He provided an outline of potential revisions to consider moving forward. The Chairman thanked Alan and recommended that the outline be used for discussion purposes at future CPC meetings.

D. Pilot Exchange Card – Due to the recent resignation of John Love consideration was given to delete the topic from future agendas. Bill Gash so moved, Allan Blume provided a second and the motion to delete the topic was approved by unanimous vote.

E. P.O.R.T.S. – Chuck Beck advised that draft renewal agreement is in the hands of NOAA to prepare the final agreement replete with NOAA signatures.

F. Legislative Update – Chuck Beck noted that the corrected language for the changes to the statutes was in the meeting package. He stated that the changes had been submitted to the legislature but he had not received any information on the status. Bill Gash inquired about the

whether or not CTDOT has a physician to determine the appropriateness of placing a CT licensed pilot in or clearing from an inactive status for medical purposes. The Chairman clarified that CTDOT would not need a doctor. The change to the statute would allow the CTDOT to inactivate a license of a pilot who could not physically perform; i.e. who could not pass the annual physical. It did not pertain to pilots who might be ill. Pilots already cover for each other in the case of illness. Chuck Beck provided a recent example of a pilot who could not perform due to bodily injury. Once the pilot recovered, he provided a doctor's certification from his own doctor that the pilot met the physical qualifications to work on his license, including the ladder climb endorsement. In response to a question, Alan Blume offered that the CG does not involve itself in matters related to fit for duty status of pilots.

4.) New Business

A. Annual Report – A revised copy of the 2010-2011 Annual Report that extended the reporting period by 6 months to get on a calendar year cycle had been distributed with the meeting package. Phil Gaughran noted and requested a minor edit in the last paragraph to reflect that the pilots had provided information on their 5 year plan. With that in mind, a motion to approve the Annual report was made by Bill Gash, seconded by Alan Blume and approved by a unanimous vote.

B. Harbor Launches – Chuck Beck noted that during the period between the February meeting and today's meeting several organizations that operate harbor launches had sent information about their capabilities. The information had previously been electronically distributed to the CPC Commissioners and interested parties. There was no further discussion.

C. Connecticut Pilot Commission - Membership – The Chairman took the opportunity to announce that this would be his last CPC meeting. He stated that he would be submitting his resignation to the appointing authority in the next week or so due to his pending move out of the state. Chuck Beck pointed out that the meeting package included a summary that matched CPC members to the appointing CT legislator. Also indicated was term expiration dates. He recommended that now would be the time to either request renewal of appointment or to notify the appointing authority of intent to resign. Joe Maco asked about the succession of leadership. The Chairman reminded all that at a previous meeting Bill Gash had been elected as the interim Vice Chairman thus until a new Chairman was appointed would lead the CPC meetings. The Chairman expressed his gratitude to the CPC Commissioners who have volunteered their time, efforts and viewpoints. He stated that he appreciates what the CPC has accomplished. Expressions of thank from the CPC members were exchanged.

5.) Rotation System Executive Board (RSEB) – Paul Costabile, the Executive Director of the RSEB, stated that there was nothing new to report except that the NY side of the RSEB has requested an RSEM meeting after the April CPC meeting, one month early from the agreed upon quarterly schedule. The topics are anticipated to be the pilotage rate increase and the dearth of harbor launches.

6.) Connecticut Department of Transportation – Comments Dave Rossiter stated that he had nothing to report but on behalf of the CTDOT added his appreciation for the job well done by the Chairman

7.) U S Coast Guard -

A LIS AMSC Update -

B LIS HSC Update – CDR Amy Beach commented on the problems with the AIS system. The NAVCEN has reported that in 2011, 30% of the underway information was inaccurate. Vessel size was 40% off. Alan Blume added that the problem is international in nature and is a major discussion at IMO meetings. Various administrations are working the problem on their respective fleets. The take away is that data/displays related to collision avoidance might be inaccurate thus should not be trusted. Phil Gaughran added that he was aware that some conventional tugs were registered as high speed vessels. Charlie Jonas stated that there was a problem in the coverage of the Port Jefferson PEL sector light. He requested the original range lights be re-established. CDR Beach stated that she was aware of the problem and it was being

revisited. Joe Maco added that regardless of the light, the day boards needed to be re-established

8.) Public Comments - Alan Blume advised that AN IHO Safety Circular was out concerning ECDIS displays. Some units are not displaying all of the needed navigational data. He advised all to review their systems and to take due caution. .

9) Executive Session – None called

10) Adjourn - A motion was made by Bill Gash to adjourn, seconded by Alan Blume and unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 0952.

The Commission's next public meeting is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Monday April 16, 2012 2012 at the ConnDOT Headquarters Building in Newington, CT