

**Connecticut Pilot Commission
Summary Report June 15, 2010 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. Pilot Commission members Rick Barry, Chuck Beck, Alan Blume, Peter Boynton, Vincent Cashin, Bill Gash, Ralph Gogliettino and John Love were present forming a quorum of eight. Also attending was Alan Stevens and Dave Rossiter of CTDOT, CDR Kevin Oditt and CWO Green of the USCG, Tom Dubno, Leonard Guercia, Charlie Jonas, Joe Maco, M.A. Peszke, and Alex Woodworth.

2.) After one minor typographical error was noted, a motion to approve the summary report of the May 18, 2010 meeting was made by Alan Blume, seconded by Vin Cashin and approved by unanimous vote

3.) Continuing Business:

A. Pilot Boat Operating Costs – Chuck Beck provided information on the number of trips/transits made during a calendar year. Referring to information that was part of the meeting package, based on historical data the average number of vessel transits requiring a state licensed pilot over a 5 year period (2004-2008) was 761 transits. Each transit involves a round trip for a pilot boat. Beck reminded all that Bill Gash had previously provided a generic model of pilot boat costs showing that the annual operating cost of a pilot boat was \$129,000.00. Thus, the operating cost of a pilot boat per vessel transit is \$169.56. However, the cost did not include any mortgage payments, a boat replacement fund or fuel costs. Beck reminded all that several months ago fuel consumption rates of the 5 pilot boats in service were coupled with the distances from two locations (Goat Island, RI and Snug Harbor, RI) to the two pilot boarding stations (Point Judith and Montauk). At a cost of an arbitrary \$2.89 per gal, the average cost of fuel for a round trip is \$ 280.62. Thus, the average cost of a round trip pilot boat run associated with a vessel transit is \$450.18. The highest cost (associated with the highest burn rate traveling the greatest distance) is \$652.73. The lowest cost (associated with the lowest burn rate traveling the shortest distance) is \$186.95. Bill Gash clarified that depreciation costs were not part of the calculations either. He then asked a question on the current level of the temporary fuel surcharge. Chuck Beck stated that he believed that the current surcharge was \$150.00. John Love stated that there should not be both a boat replacement charge and depreciation. In response to a question, Charlie Jonas stated that a new pilot boat would cost between \$800K and \$1M. Joe Maco stated that a heavy boat designed for all weather conditions would cost at least \$1M. There was some discussion as to whether depreciation on a pilot boat would be 20 or 37 years. Bill Gash returned the conversation to the operating costs. He stated that the CPC review of pilot boat costs was initiated to validate the fuel surcharge. The Chairman agreed then added that the next item was an attempt to create a fuel surcharge index that could be applied to a base price automatically as one piece of a large picture. That effort led to an attempt to validate the original \$600 per trip charge to a pilot for pilot boat service. In response to a question about “where do we go from here”, Chuck Beck added that the CTDOT Commissioner has the authority to regulate pilot boat costs. Thus, he felt that all of the pilot boat costs determinations should result in a charge to the pilotage regulations that would establish a set cost/charge per transit of a pilot boat. Bill Gash agreed that a near term goal should be to codify the pilot boat charges in the CT regulation.

B Objectives and Goals

(1) Apprentice Selection and Training Regulation - Chuck Beck stated that the draft Apprentice Selection and Training regulation had been approved by OPM and forwarded to the Governor's office for review/approval. In response to a question on the process, Beck stated that once the document cleared the Governor's office, public notification would be published in the CT Law Journal as an “Intent to Amend a Regulation”. A 30 day comment period would be allowed. Once

comments and responses were completed, the document would go to the Legislature's Regulatory Review Committee for review/approval. In response to a question on the overall timeline to complete the process, Beck stated that barring any unforeseen delays, the draft regulation could become effective within 3 to 4 months.

(2) Goals and Objectives Review and Discussion – The Chairman reminded all of the CPC letter to the CTDOR Commissioner dated 6/24/2009 that detailed the CPC's Objectives and Goals. He then reviewed the Objective and Goals document that the CPC had created and submitted as an attachment to the letter. A question was posed to the Commission members as to whether or not the Objectives and Goals were still current or needed to be modified. As the Chairman stepped through the document the Objectives were found to be current. Most Goals were still pending. Some progress had been made on a couple of Goals. Some updates were offered on specific Goals by various CPC members. Under 1.a.ii and 1.a.iii, Alan Blume stated that the CPC needed to get something on paper on the continuing training requirement for licensed pilots. A method of paying for the training also needed to be addressed but establishing a training plan needed to come first. Blume stated that some work on a training plan had been done. He and Vince Cashin agreed to serve as a committee and resurrect/update the past work. There was some discussion on the need for a rate change to pay for continuing training of licensed pilots with analogies made to other licensed professions who have to pay for required refresher training requirements out of pocket. The main difference between pilots and others is that the pilotage rates are set by regulation where the other professions for the most part can increase their rates to cover training costs. Under 2.c., Chuck Beck was asked to pursue codifying the pilot boat charges as a change to the CT Regulation as previously discussed. The Chairman appreciated the discussion but got to the bottom line question of whether or not the issues listed should remain on the Objectives and Goals list of things to do. There was general concurrence to keep all on the list and thus on the Agenda for future meetings. Under item 3.a, (working towards a single pilot organization for CT licensed pilots), Joe Maco stated that the Goal should be modified to establishing a single pilot organization for all of the pilots who work in LIS, not just the CT licensed pilots. Vin Cashin stated that establishing a CT organization was the first step towards a single LIS organization. Under item 4 (establishing standard operating procedures), Alan Blume stated that the CPC needed to highlight sub Goals (v), Incident and Casualty Investigations. The general discussion ended with a request by the Chairman for all to review the Objectives and Goals and for the Commissioners to submit comments to him no later than July 1, 2010.

C. Recency Issues –Chuck Beck pointed out that contained in the meeting package was correspondence initiated by Captain Phil Gaughran concerning an assignment to pilot a vessel into Port Jefferson. The problem presented was that there had not been any traffic requiring a state licensed pilot for quite some time thus the current licensed pilots did not have any recency for the port. Beck stated that working with the Executive Director of the Board of Commissioners of Pilots for the State of NY, a solution had been developed that would provide the pilot services requirement while insuring safety. Any pilot assigned to work in Port Jefferson had to have a current First Class Pilot's license for the Port Jefferson. If the assigned pilot did not have a recent trip into/out of the port within the last 6 months, then the pilot would be required to make a roundtrip transit as an observer before accepting any assigned work as the pilot of record. If the assigned pilot did not have a recent trip into out of the port within the past 12 months, then the pilot would be required to make 2 roundtrip transits (one day, one night) before accepting any assigned work as the pilot of record. The recency requirement was transmitted to the Joint Rotation Administrator and licensed pilots via e-mail. Questions were raised by Vin Cashin concerning other ports and MOA waters where vessel transits and declined/disappeared, specifically New London, Bridgeport and the Western End of LIS. Chuck Beck responded that there were enough transits of the New London and Bridgeport waters by US flagged vessels such as tugs and ferries that would allow pilots to maintain recency through ride alongs. The Western End was more problematic. Vin Cashin and others stated that the Connecticut Pilots Association was looking into chartering a vessel to provide a trip to and from the Western End of LIS to maintain recency for a number of pilots. The discussion turned to piloting foreign flag yachts into smaller harbors within the MOA waters. There presently is no Federal endorsement available

for many if not all of the smaller ports such as Mystic, Stonington, Norwalk, Greenwich, etc where the foreign flagged yachts often call. Joe Maco stated that whatever the decision is on the recency whether it be for the larger or smaller ports, there needed to be one policy for both sides of the rotation, NY and CT. It was decided that the best course of action would be for the CTDOT and hopefully the NY Board to provide specific guidance to the Joint Rotation Administrator via a letter.

4.) New Business

A. Public Health and Quarantine Issues – Len Guercia from CTDPH was introduced. Chuck Beck provided some background on the public health related issues that had recently been discussed at CPC meetings. One issue was trying to get the pilots moved up on the priority list when vaccinations are being offered in response to a perceived infectious disease outbreak. A second issue involved decisions to quarantine a pilot aboard a ship that had a crew member with a suspected infectious disease. CDR Oditt provided background on a meeting held to discuss the quarantine issue that involved CTDOH, the CG and some pilots. The bottom line is that communications is the key and a better effort would be made by the CG to inform the Joint Rotation administrator of any suspected infectious disease concerns hopefully before the pilot board. Len Guercia provided background on his involvement with maritime related public health issues. He stated that a protocol was developed among CTDPH, the CG and CTDEMHS several years ago after an incident aboard an inbound ship. For the most part the local public health official is responsible for determining the appropriate response to a reported infectious disease. However, both CTDOH and the CDC must be notified and will sometimes intervene. There is never any intent to put the pilot at risk. Len Guercia asked if the pilots routinely carry N-95 rated respirators/masks. Charlie Jonas stated that procuring the masks was being considered. Len Guercia offered free training on the proper fitting and use of the masks. The Chairman asked Vin Cashin to reach out to the pilots and organize a training session with Len Guercia. Len concluded his remarks by stating that OSHA 19A299 details standards of use as related to various physical ailments thus, a workplace protocol needed to be developed for the pilots prior to the training. In response to a question, it was stated that the N-95 masks were disposable with no shelf life. A case of N-95 masks cost approximately \$100. There was additional discussion on the need to minimize contact with a person suspected to be infectious as well as the CG decision making process relative to keeping the pilot onboard vs removing him at the same time as the crew member for medical evaluation. Len Guercia stated that the CTDH does not have any authority to order a pilot to a hospital for an evaluation or to be admitted as a patient. CDR Oditt added that the CG will not allow a vessel to enter pilotage waters if it is known in advance that there is a crew member with certain infectious diseases. The Chairman brought the discussion to a close by summarizing that (1) the CG has committed to reviewing the protocols and improving communications with the pilots through the Joint Rotation Administrator and (2) training and assist with PPE protocols to the pilots.

5. CONNDOT Comments – Dave Rossiter advised that the aforementioned recency requirement was actually in the CT General Statutes not the state regulations. He also stated that the Statute was silent on a prolonged lack of recency; i.e. beyond 6 months. Dave advised that it had been recently announced that a high speed ferry service was being started between NYC and New London. The service would be limited to weekends initially. However, the service has the potential to be used to retain recency from the West End of LIS and the Port of New London..

6. USCG Comments

A. LIS AMSC – CDR Kevin Oditt announced that an Executive Committee of the LIS AMSC was meeting this morning in Bridgeport. He also provided information relative to a draft CG policy letter that is intended to clarify involvement of interested parties when a marine casualty investigation is required. The new policy could negate an MOA that CG Sector LIS has with the NY Board of Commissioners. CDR Oditt introduced the new CG Sector LIS Aids to Navigation Officer CWO James Green.

B. LIS HSC – CDR Oditt stated that 45 CG members of CG Sector LIS are currently deployed to the Gulf of Mexico region assisting with the oil rig casualty and oil clean up. He reminded all that the hurricane season has officially started and reminded all to check their heavy weather plans. A discussion about the probability of a hurricane affecting the CG Sector LIS area ensued. It was stated that NOAA predicts this year could be the most active hurricane season on record.

7. Executive Session – An Executive Session was requested. The CPC Commissioners recessed into Executive Session at 1004. The CPC reconvened the public meeting at 1034. Chairman Boynton announced that no motions were made and no votes were taken during the Executive Session.

A motion was made by John Love for the CPC to send a letter to the CTDOT requesting an investigation into the possible violation of security protocol at the New Haven Terminal by a CT licensed state Pilot. The motion was seconded by Alan Blume and was passed by unanimous vote.

8. A motion to adjourn was made by Vin Cashin, seconded by Bill Gash and approved by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 1036.

The Commission's next public meeting is scheduled for **8:30 a.m. on Tuesday July 20, 2010 at the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound in New Haven, CT**

Peter Boynton
Chairman, Connecticut Pilot Commission