

**Connecticut Pilot Commission
Summary Report February 22, 2011 Public Meeting
Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound
New Haven, CT**

1.) The public meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by the Vice Chairman. Pilot Commission members Rick Barry, Chuck Beck, Alan Blume, Bill Gash, Phil Gaughran, Ralph Gogliettino and John Love were present forming a quorum of seven. Also attending was CTDOT Deputy Commissioner Al Martin, Dave Rossiter of CTDOT, Captain Joe Vojvodich Commander CG Sector LIS, CDR Amy Beech of CG Sector LIS, Paul Costabile, Tom Dubno, Charlie Jonas, David Keene, Keith Kelsey, Joe Maco, Bill Mulligan and Alex Woodworth..

2.) A motion to approve the summary report of the December 22, 2010 meeting was made by Bill Gash, seconded by John Love and approved unanimously.

3.) Continuing Business:

A. Goals and Objectives –No comments offered. Topic will remain on agenda for March

B. Recency Issues – Alan Blume reported that had contacted several port areas and obtained some information on how other states are handling recency issues in the face of reduced vessel traffic. After cautioning that his search was not scientific, he determined that no other port area was relaxing recency requirements due to fewer opportunities. In response to a question, Alan reported that other port areas were allowing the pilots to be creative using rides on vessel not requiring a pilot. Charlie Jonas stated that the CT Pilots have adopted the practice of having a pilot on each watch who is recent in all of the waters. He stated that a watch is a two week period. He also stated that the CT pilots had been using ferry rides and even paying \$1,500 to a launch service at one time.

C. Joint Rotation Administration – Chuck Beck reminded all that a request at the December 2010 CPC meeting had been made for a copy of the contract between the CTDOT/NY Board and the Joint Rotation Administrator (JRA). It was subsequently determined that there was no contract per se. The Memorandum of Agreement and the Governing Document for the Joint Marine Pilot Rotation System allowed for the establishment of the rotation and an administrator. Copies of both were distributed electronically to the CPC Commissioners on 12/23/2010. The Governing Document dated January 15, 2004 appointed Sound Pilots, Inc (d.b.a. Block Island Pilots) to serve as the Joint Administrator of the Joint Rotation system. Phil Gaughran stated that paragraph 12 of the Governing Document required the pilots to pay the JRA an administration fee of 5.5% of the pilotage fees for each ship. It also allowed for the administrative fee to be adjusted if a profit or loss is realized. He questioned the need for an audit and who might conduct the audit. Joe Maco stated that the pilots (specifically Cashin and Warner) had looked into the administrative fee in the past and determined no adjustment was needed. He emphasized that it was up to the pilots thought the Rotation System Executive Board (RSEB) to audit the account not the CPC. Phil Gaughran stated that the RSEB was going to meet immediately after the CPC meeting.

4.) New Business

A. CT State Pilots (CSP) 5 Year Plan – Charlie Jonas asked that the topic be deferred to the March meeting. Legal documents associated with the creation of the CSP had only recently been returned from the lawyers and not all of the CSP members had had an opportunity to review.

B. Temporary Fuel Charge – Chuck Beck advised the CPC Commissioners of actions he had taken to extend the Temporary Fuel Surcharge in the absence of a timely request by the pilot boat operators and no CPC meeting in January due to weather. He stated that this was the second consecutive unilateral action for the same reasons. Paul Costabile asked if the effective period could be expanded to a 12 month cycle vs the present 6 month cycle. John Love stated that another option would be for CTDOT to deal with the Temporary Fuel Surcharge without any CPC action in the future. Chuck Beck reminded all that the temporary fuel surcharge was only part of a larger issue: the actual cost of operating a pilot boat and the past refusal of boat operators to provide data. Several months ago an attempt was made to obtain data so that the pilot boat rate could be codified into the CT Regulations. There was a discussion on the genesis of the temporary fuel surcharge, the volatile market, and the need for using an index. A review of the efforts to determine a base cost with an indexed fuel rate was provided. There was further discussion on a model that was created. The discussion ended with all agreeing to keep the topic on the agenda and to revisit the previous work done on the model.

C. Pilotage Rates and Fees – Chuck Beck provided a summary of the last time the CPC reviewed the pilotage rates and the 18% rate increase (6% each year for 3 years) that resulted. He also referred back to the discussion on pilot boat fees stating that such fees should be codified and made part of a large rate increase. Phil Gaughran stated that pilotage rates were on the agenda for the RSEB meeting. All agreed to carry the topic over to the March CPC meeting to allow the RSEB to make a proposal via letter. John Love provided some insight into MARAD funds that might be available to pilot boat owners that would be exempt from tax on build to replace and operating costs.

D. Request for Pilot – The Vice Chairman reference the letter from the CT State Pilots contained in the meeting package that requested the process be initiated for CT to issue another state pilot license. The Vice Chairman deferred to CTDOT Deputy Commissioner Al Martin who sought clarification on the request: was it for a new license or for a solicitation for applicants to the apprentice program. Charlie Jonas clarified that the request was for the CTDOT to make a solicitation for applicants to the apprentice program. He further stated that the process seeking the most qualified applicants took too long given the age of the currently CT licensed pilots. The CSP had already started training pilots under a program similar to the newly approved regulations months before. The training program used was created by Interport and approved by the NJ Pilot Commission. He indicated that due to the present circumstances, CSP could not wait two years for an apprentice to complete the training program now specified in CT regulations. Vice Chairman Barry reminded all that last year the CPC and CTDOT responded to a similar request for an immediate licensing of a new pilot. At the conclusion of the selection process, 2 top candidates were identified. However, the CPC was adamant that they only needed 1 new pilot despite being specifically asked if 2 would be better due to the age of the pilots. Charlie Jonas stated that the circumstances were different now. Two CT licensed pilots were now only working a ½ share each. The pilot licensed last year is covering their resultant full share of the work. Another pilot has indicated that he too wants to reduce his work to a ½ share. The remaining pilots can not cover his work. Rick Barry stated that the circumstances just described are the same as were presented a year ago. Charlie Jonas went on to say that the 2 people under presently under training for the past 2 years have all of the requisite trips needed for a license then asked if they would count or not. The Vice Chairman stated that there needed to be an apprentice selected first then the matter of which trips should count for what could be discussed. Alan Blume pointed out that since the newly established apprentice regulation does not address the matter it would be up to the CTDOT's discretion. Joe Maco expressed his concern related to a previous agreement that the Block Island Pilots was to be the entity that all pilots on both sides of the rotation would eventually migrate into. The CT pilots signed an agreement that specified that as they attrite out, the 70/30 split would be adjusted to an eventual 50/50 split. He feared that people were now drifting away from the original intent to form one organization under Sound Pilots. Chuck Beck acknowledged the existence of the document referenced by Joe but stated that none of the documents/agreements signed prior to the MOA between the CTDOT and the NY Board were in play. He continued commenting on his concerns about how the training rides

currently being conducted outside of the apprentice program should be counted. They could/should be counted during the application and selection process. Whether or not they should be counted again towards instant completion of the apprentice training program is another matter. Alan Blume stated that the CPC needed a long range view on the needs for new pilots so that the CPC could better manage the apprentice application process. In response to a question from Bill Gash, Charlie Jonas stated that the long term needs for ne pilots will be part of the 5 year plan to be presented in March. Deputy Commissioner Martin stated that maritime safety is critical and that the apprentice selection and training process is a key element. The CTDOT needs a well established process for licensing. CTDOT Commissioner Parker indicated to the Deputy that he wants to look at the process, the proposed activity, the current number of pilots, the projected number of pilots needed as well as other factors. Following the newly passed Apprentice Selection and Training regulation is a good start. He also asked that the current work load share (70/30) to be reviewed as part of the discussion about the need for new pilots. He believes that working within a single pilot organization will assist in reaching the CTDOT's goal of maritime safety. The Vice Chairman asked for a motion. Bill Gash moved that the CPC ask the CTDOT to initiate the apprentice pilot application process through a public notice. The motion was seconded by Alan Blume and passed by unanimous vote. Chuck Beck advised that the timeline would be 6 to 8 weeks mostly due to the time it takes to get the public notice into the CT Law Journal and the 30 day notice requirement.

5. CONNDOT Comments – Dave Rossiter stated that he had with him a copy of the recent Army Corps of engineers sounding survey of the State Pier facility for anybody who cared to review it. In response to a question from Bill Gash, Dave stated that there were no surprises. In response to a question from Joe Maco about whether or not there were any plans to remove the shallow spots in the approach to the State Pier Chuck Beck responded yes. He then provided an update on the Deficiency and Needs Study being conducted by a consultant for the CTDOT on the State Pier facility. Deputy Commissioner Martin related the new administrations stated plans to put more focus on CT ports as economic drivers.

6. USCG Comments

A. LIS AMSC – CDR Amy Beech stated that the CPC request to be added to the distribution for the CONNOP letters of promulgation had been done.

B. LIS HSC – CDR Amy Beach stated that determination about whether or not the new anchorage areas negated the use of the old or other anchorage areas had been made. The newly published anchorage regulation does not disestablish already charted Special and General Anchorage areas. Nor does it prevent the use of those anchorage areas or other areas, by commercial vessels where use of the newly established anchorages is not practical or when safety or weather concerns exist. CDR Beach stated that a copy of the letter with the determination would be provided to the CPC via Chuck Beck.

7. Public Comment – Alan Blume provided information and perspective on accident investigations related to pilot/master relations. The most common factor found is that the pilot was not fully integrated into the bridge team. Some times the cause was a language barrier. Other times there was a drop in attentiveness on the part of the bridge team once the pilot took the con. Charlie Jonas related his experience on getting the bridge team involved. Alan Blume reminded all that it was best to keep the conversation professional due to the recordings made. There was some additional discussion concerning the requirements and methods to report casualties, the lack of a requirement for continued education/training in the CT regulations, and a recent investigation involving sleep apnea.

Chuck Beck inquired about the possibility of moving the March 22nd meeting to the western end of the state to accommodate those who were planning on attending the CT Maritime Association conference being held in Stamford 21-23 March 2011. Consensus was that holding the meeting in New Haven as planned would be best.

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

9. A motion to adjourn was made by Ralph Gogliettino, seconded by Bill Gash and approved by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 0953.

The Commission's next public meeting is scheduled for **8:30 a.m. on Tuesday March 22, 2011 at the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound in New Haven, CT**

Rick Barry
Vice Chairman, Connecticut Pilot Commission