

HB 7869

PA 797

1971

Senate

3355

House

4004

Environment

531-532, 537-542

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 26

of the bill, as amended, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it, the bill is passed.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal to the House, On cal. 786, Cal. 1172 and Cal. 677.

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection, it is so-ordered.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, by agreement of the Minority and the Majority parties, may we take up on a Consent Motion, the following matters: I move for the adoption of the joint committee's favorable reports and the passage of the bills: On page two of the Calendar, 987, File No. 1125, Substitute House Bill 6484. An Act Concerning Personal Property Liens in Favor of Municipality 1101, File 1288, Substitute House Bill 7869, An Act Concerning State Pilots and Pilotage. Page 4, of the Calendar, Cal. 1190, File 1103, Sub House Bill 6709, An Act Concerning An Establishment of a Five Mile River Commission. Cal. 1196, File 1373, Sub House Bill 8671, An Act Concerning Acquisition of Case Mountain for use of A State Park. Cal. 1210, File 1425, Sub House Bill 5760, An Act Authorizing the Treasurer to Replace Mutilated, Defaced, Destroyed, Stolen or Lost State Obligations. Page 5, Cal. 1221, File 787, Sub House Bill 8334, An Act Concerning the Number of Resident State Policemen. Cal. 1224, File 930, House Bill 8453, An Act Concerning Military Funerals for National Guardsmen. Cal. 1230, File 1375, Sub House Bill 7929, An Act Concerning Second Taxing District of Norwalk. Cal. 1241, File 1471, Sub House Bill 5046. An Act Concerning Holding and Sale of Bonds to the State and the Pension Fund of the Teachers Retirement System. Page 6, Cal. 1242, File 1481

H-116

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 9
3878-4343**

Friday, May 28, 1971 5.

cosmetology. If there are no objections, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committees' favorable reports and the passage of those items on the Consent Calendar. EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any individual objections? If not, the question's on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Opposed. The Bills are passed.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, I move suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of the one-star items on the Consent Calendar as per our announcement yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended.

JOHN D. PRETE:

On Page 1 of the Calendar, Calendar No. 1162, Substitute for H.B. No. 6433, File No. 1287, an Act concerning fees for transcript of Motor Vehicle Department hearings; Calendar No. 1163, H.B. No. 6437, File No. 1286, an Act concerning vehicles exempt from the Title Law; Calendar No. 1164, Substitute for H.B. No. 6439, File No. 1285, an Act concerning Motor Vehicle Department collection fees; Calendar No. 1167, H.B. No. 6870, an Act concerning a centralized microfilm service for State agencies, File No. 1301; Calendar No. 1168, Substitute for H.B. No. 7869, File No. 1288, an Act concerning State pilots and pilotage; on Page 3 of the Calendar, Calendar No. 1187, Substitute for H.B. No. 7015, File No. 1312, an Act concerning wholesale permits.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 2
339-691**

1971

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

Chairman Pac presiding;
Sens: Pac, Gunther, Cashman, Eddy
Reps: Ciampi, Griswold, Matthews, Clark,
Iwanicki, Ryan, Platt, Avcollie, Lavine,
Pugliese, Hogan, Tiffany, Locke, Miller,
Stroffolino, Fox, Grab, McNellis, Yavavone,
Della Vecchia

Chairman Pac: We'll open the meeting to the legislators. Speaker Ratchford.

Rep. Ratchford: Senator Pac, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is significant to note that this is for the record. I would further indicate that the legislation which I will discuss, I've already discussed with the House members of the Committee on the Environment, and will discuss it further; I've had conversations with your counterpart in the House, Frank Ciampi, who is arriving now. But it relates to a subject that is vital to us in western Connecticut, and I think it's a subject which, if it's explored properly, which if developed, which if implemented by the General Assembly in this session can be come a model for the state of Connecticut.

And that is the subject matter of H.B. 7984. AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A STATE PARK ALONG ROUTE SEVEN BETWEEN NORWALK AND NEW MILFORD, which concerns itself with a linear park from Norwalk to New Milford. For too long, those of us who have served in the General Assembly have automatically, each time requested to come in for highways, authorized their approval. Too frequently, we stand guilty of the fact that as we have approved money for concrete, we have not shown sufficient concern for the environment, which it has displaced. This bill would provide an opportunity as Route 7 is constructed, which is vitally necessary to western Connecticut, that it is constructed in a fashion which not only preserves, but enhances the environment. This legislation calls for a linear park, which will be explained in detail by several active citizens who have worked so diligently in the development of this program. It would allow the citizens of that part of the state, and indeed, the entire state and nation, to capitalize on and take advantage of the environmental beauty of that section of Connecticut.

Along with the development of Route 7, if this bill is approved here, and by the Appropriations Committee in the Assembly, with some acquisition of land for trails, for bicycling, for riding on horseback, for nature paths, but just in general for the environment, so that as we develop a highway, we develop a highway which is complementary to and enhances the environment. And I think that this committee, which is serving in its first term, which has already reported out much landmark legislation in the area of the environment, would take another giant step forward, if you would approve this bill, and approve an accompanying bill, which recognizes the general concept - that general concept specifically that, as we build highways, it should be with an environmental outlook. I'm sure your committee will do this, I implore you to do so, and I tell you you will hear diligent details and intelligent commentary on this program, which is set here before you in detail by the committee for a linear park on Route 7. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Rep. Hill: Senator Pac, and Representative Ciampi, my name is Mary Hill, and I'm from the 67th District. I am here to register my objection to H.B. 7869.

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

AN ACT CONCERNING STATE PILOTS AND PILOTAGE. My objection is based upon the fact that it places an increased burden upon existing pilots. The question of pilotage extending to all federal waters within the jurisdiction of Connecticut may well raise serious constitutional questions. I would also like to know what is meant by the wording "requiring pilots to meet more exacting U. S. Coast Guard Standards." All pilots at the present time must pass U. S. Coast Guard standards in order to be licensed as such pilots. The compelling of one, after 1973, to hold a Master's License, places an undue burden on pilots who don't hold a Master's License, but who have been pilots in the various ports over the years. The pilots are familiar with our port, and are not necessarily familiar with other ports in the state of Connecticut. To compel pilots to be familiar with all the ports places an undue burden upon them.

Moreover, a question comes up under Section 7 as to what will happen to existing pilots who do not have a Master's License after January 1, 1973. Certainly it seems to me that there should be a grandfather clause, so that existing pilots will not be prejudiced and not be able to work after January 1973. This would also raise a serious constitutional question of due process. The raising of the bond from \$500 to \$5,000 seems excessive. Perhaps a more reasonable bond might be in the sum of \$1,000 - but certainly \$5,000 is far beyond what I consider a reasonable bond. I feel that the bill as such requires further study, and I am opposed to its passage in its present form, and I urge you to give this your favorable consideration. Thank you very much.

Rep. Fabrizio: State Representative John Fabrizio, 147th District, Norwalk, Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, committee members on Environment. I am in favor of H.B. 798b which provides for the establishment of a state park along Route 7 between Norwalk and New Milford, introduced by House Speaker, Mr. Ratchford. I'm also in favor of H.B. 5936, AN ACT CONCERNING BRIDLE PATHS, PEDESTRIAN WALKS, BICYCLE PATHS AND LINEAR PARKS, which provides for the establishment of bridle paths, pedestrian walks, bicycle paths and linear parks, also introduced by the Honorable Mr. William Ratchford, Speaker of the House. We all know that most of our open space, and even some of our parks, have disappeared due to housing development, and road construction needs. It only seems fair and proper that the state start giving back to the towns some of the land in parks it has digested for road construction. In Norwalk alone, Route 7 has taken part of two of our only remaining parks. Parks and recreational facilities are proposed in these bills, and are a necessary and crucial part of everyone's life. I quote a letter written by Council President of the Boy Scouts of America, Mauwehu Council, Stewart Gregory.

"On behalf of the 8,000 Boy Scouts, Cub Scouts and Explorers in the Mauwehu Council, I want to express our interest in the proposed linear park along the new Route 7. As you probably know, each year it is becoming more and more difficult for our boys to find suitable areas to hike and ride their bicycles. We feel that the linear park would lend itself ideally to the needs of Scouts."

I personally feel that a linear park will be a major step in the right direction to help preserve the much needed open space. I recommend a favorable report on this bill, these bills; Thank you.

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

Rep. Stevens: Representative Gerald Stevens, 122nd District, Milford, Connecticut, appearing in favor of H.B. 7869, an act concerning state pilots and pilotage. The pilots to which I make reference are not the kind that go up in the air, I'm referring to the pilots who pilot commercial vessels into the ports of the state of Connecticut. At the present time, the question of pilotage in Connecticut is extremely loosely regulated. Until 1969 the issuance of pilot's licenses was handled by the Superior Court, which did nothing whatsoever concerning regulation of the industry. In 1969 I submitted a bill which transferred jurisdiction to the State Boating Commission. The purpose of the legislation before you now is to empower the State Boating Commission to issue regulations concerning the duty, conduct, qualifications and training of state pilots. This is extremely important when you bear in mind the unfortunate oil spills that have occurred in the state of Connecticut during the past few years. The most recent one in New Haven harbor is a case in point. Ships bringing oil into our waters should have on board a qualified licensed pilot. Ships now which have foreign registry must have a pilot on board, but the Boating Commission, which has jurisdiction over pilots, does not now have statutory authority to issue regulations concerning training or qualifications of the pilots. I think this is a very serious gap in our law, and one which we should correct. Fortunately, we did see fit in 1969 to transfer the jurisdiction over the pilots to another state agency, other than the judicial system, which it certainly never should have been in to begin with. But I think now we have to take steps to insure that vessels coming into our harbors have on board pilots who are of the highest caliber, well trained, and are subject to the complete jurisdiction of the Boating Commission. This is the purpose behind the legislation, and I understand that the Director of the Boating Commission will be here today to answer any questions you might have, concerning what they've done in the past two years, since they have had jurisdiction over pilots.

Sen. Pac: Thank you. Any other legislators? If not, we'll now transfer to Room 409. - We will begin the public portion, and we will first call on Mr. Arconti, Mayor Arconti of Danbury.

Mayor Arconti: My name is Gino J. Arconti, I am the mayor of the city of Danbury, I'm here to support H.B. 7984 which provides for a linear park along Route 7. We think this is a great concept, it deserves the support of the General Assembly, it has had local support. When four towns along the route have been called upon for local funds to support a feasibility study, there was enthusiastic support by the legislative bodies in these communities and by the people living within these towns to pursue a feasibility study, with the hopes of eventually seeing to it that construction could be implemented for a linear park along Route 7. And on behalf of all my citizens, I wish to make a strong appeal for this bill.

Mr. Woodcock: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is J. M. Woodcock, I am the First Selectman of Ridgefield. Ridgefield is one of the four towns involved. The new Route 7 goes directly through our town on one side. It cuts mainly through a residential area, and while Route 7 is very needed, and we need it really right now, it will create many problems for our town, and we feel that this linear park will soften a great many of our problems there. It will also give the opportunity for our youth to have a space where they can bicycle and tramp, hike, in a safe and attractive place.

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

Our town is very strong for it, and I think the best proof of that was when they brought it to a town meeting, they willingly voted their own money to support this feasibility study. I really believe that if we just had this in use, and it's there for a year or two, we'll be trying to mandate all new through highways to do the same. I thank you, and I hope it will go through.

Mr. Rafferty: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Attorney J. Ward Rafferty, I'm associated with the firm of A. A. Washton in New London. Mr. Washton has suffered a heart attack, and he asked me to represent him here. We represent the New London Pilots Association. I'd like to speak on H.B. 7869 and preface my remarks by saying that we are against it in its present form. We think the bill needs more study and more information, and we'd be only too happy to meet with any subcommittee at any time to see what can be worked out in that regard.

We do have some objections we'd like to voice now. For instance, on line 17 of the bill, it mentions docking vessels. We'd like to point out that while vessels have to be docked, they also have to be undocked, and these are two distinct operations. It could have dire environmental consequences, if a man was not properly trained in undocking a vessel. Also, the bill in its present form calls for a man to hold both a Master's license and a Pilot's license. While it's technically feasible to have a man obtain a Master's license in three years, practically speaking it's impossible within six or seven. We'd like to see a grandfather's clause included in this bill to protect current pilots who do not also hold Master's licenses. Also, we'd like to point out that the technical skills involved in Master's and in Pilot's are two distinct operations. A Master would have to qualify as a pilot before he could pilot any vessels in Connecticut waters. Also, the term "waters" is used in the bill. We'd ask why "waters" instead of ports? This means pilots would have to go a greater distance out to sea, there are certain areas of the year when it would create a great hazard to both the pilots, their crews, and the crews of the vessel, and this could also have dire environmental consequences. We'd like to see this studied. It calls for an increase in bond from \$500 to \$5,000. We feel that this jump, given the income of the pilots, is really uncalled for. Finally, the pilots have to be licensed by the United States Coast Guard, they have to meet exacting standards from the Coast Guard. They are licensed by the federal authorities, the United States Coast Guard, for a period of five years. Connecticut law currently calls for a licensing every three years. The present bill would cut it down to one. This also has implications for the pilots. They could obtain cheaper bond rates, particularly if the bond is increased, by holding their license every three or five years; it would make more sense to raise Connecticut to five years to conform with the federal licensing. This would not mean that a man who was guilty of malfeasance as a pilot could not have his license suspended. That's called for in Section 1, subsection (e).

Again, we don't wish to take up the committee's time. We know you have many people to hear today. We simply would like to point out we think this bill deserves more study, more information is needed, and we'd only too happy to meet with any subcommittee or furnish any information that the committee itself feels that it needs. Thank you for your time.

Capt. Brogan: Mr. Chairman and the committee. I am opposed to the bill, H.B. 7869 as it is written. I am in accord with all that that Mr. Rafferty has just said. I would also like to add in regard to the requirement for

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

Master of Ocean license. I have a Master of Ocean License, and the work that I did, while a master on an ocean ship, was of no use to me in the work as pilot in New London harbor. It is an entirely different sphere of shipping, and any pilot should have a good tug background in order to be an efficient pilot. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Knurek: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Adam F. Knurek of the Department of Transportation. I'd like to speak in favor of both H.B. 7984 and H.B. 5936. First I'll address my remarks to H.B. 7984. The Department of Transportation is in general agreement with the intent of this bill, but as previous speakers have mentioned, and others undoubtedly will, these bills go together. H.B. 5936, an act concerning bridle paths, pedestrian walks, bicycle paths and linear parks, which is more general in nature and would establish the responsibility and procedures for the provisions of pathways, walks and linear parks along state-maintained highways on a state-wide basis. Our Department suggests that the first sentence of H.B. 7984 be rewritten as follows: "The Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources is directed to establish a linear park along the relocation of Route 7 between Norwalk and New Milford, utilizing land adjoining said highway and acquired for this purpose. The Commissioner of Agriculture and Natural Resources may request the Commissioner of Transportation to utilize the highway rights of way, when it is not practicable and in the public interest to acquire land adjacent to said Route 7. If the Commissioner of Transportation agrees to such requests, he may place such restrictions, conditions and qualifications on the use of any area, within the right of way, as he deems and determines to be necessary to provide for the safety and adequacy of highway facilities and for the protection of abutting and adjacent land users." Incidentally, our present statute in regard to the use of air rights has very similar language, and H.B. 5936 which not only concerns linear parks, does address itself to other uses, such as multiple use in joint development within the state highway rights of way. We believe we should have the same authority in both bills.

I have a substitute bill which incorporates this language and reflects that thing, which I'll leave with you. In regard to H.B. 5936, I believe that I can say that I wrote all the new parts. And I'd like to point out that there are two different concepts in H.B. 5936 - one which is an expansion of the present Section 13a-141 concerning bridle paths, footpaths and bicycle paths. In this, the former Department of Transportation Commissioner agreed that, if a town requested to use the highway rights of way for these purposes, the Department of Transportation would pay for half of the cost, which is very different from the rest of this Section 1 of H.B. 5936, which requires that whoever requests a permit for a bicycle path, foot path, or bridle path to ride horses, must pay for the construction of it, and maintenance, and so forth. Now Section 2, which is the other concept, the concept of linear parks, it was decided that the Department of Transportation would actually expend the monies to acquire land adjacent to the highway, because they'd be doing it at the same time, and actually pay for it. However, we did not feel that we should go into the park business; therefore, the responsibility for maintaining and keeping up the linear park would be on the Commissioner of Agriculture and Natural Resources. As far as the use of the highway rights of way, again where it's feasible, we favor that concept. And we favor these bills, and think they're both good bills and should, with the modifications that I've presented, be in the best interests of the state, and we urge your passage.

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

113706j
Mr. Chalecki: Mr. Chairman, my name is Bernard Chalecki, and I'm the Director of the Boating Commission. I have with me two of my commissioners that I'd like to introduce, Captain Madden and Commissioner Mopsik. I also have Commander Knoft, in charge of the marine inspection station at New London, who is here. He would like, if there are any questions regarding the federal authority, he is here, mainly as an observer, but he said that if any questions are given to him in writing, either now or in the future, he will see that an answer is returned from the Coast Guard Headquarters. I would now like to comment on the changes in an act concerning pilots and state pilots. This act would require all applicants to have Master's licenses of unlimited tonnage, and a pilot's endorsement, which are issued by the U. S. Coast Guard, and the reason why we are asking this - this is the highest license that the U. S. Coast Guard gives. This is a requirement that is in the present Rhode Island state law. Generally speaking, if the state does not have an apprenticeship program, they require a Master's license. New York does not require a Master's license, but they have an elaborate eleven-year program before a pilot can pilot a vessel of unlimited tonnage and unlimited depth. I want to point out that, when a pilot is aboard a ship, he is in effect the Master of that vessel. He is in command, to all intents and purposes, there are fine legal definitions, but generally speaking, he is in command.

This would authorize the Commission to adopt regulations concerning all vessels, and the conduct, duty and training of licensed pilots. I want to point out that there are two types of vessels coming into the harbor, and of course, as I want to point out right from the beginning, that the pilots presently piloting the boats under compulsory state pilotages are good pilots, and I think they're members of a vanishing breed. They're not afraid to speak out, they're independent, and they know their work. Under the compulsory pilotage system, foreign vessels and American vessels on the register, which means that they go on foreign ports, are required to take a state pilot. Now the state pilot goes aboard these vessels, as far as I can determine, I've been aboard these vessels, they are in command. The Captain will accept their orders, and since we've been in business, there has never been an incident that I have known where the pilots have had damage on a ship that was required to have a state pilot. There are also boats coming in that are not required to have a state pilot, although they are required to have licensed federal pilots, which we think is all right, because they go from one state to another. These are what are called coastal vessels. They're American ships manned by American officers. What we would like to do at least is to come up with regulations regarding the ship when it enters the harbor, or the dredge channels, for example, in New London, is 33 feet; in New Haven 35 feet, and some of the ships coming in are practically scraping the bottom. And we feel that some regulations should come. For example, when they almost scrape the bottom, maybe something should come in about coming in at high tide, particularly because there's a possibility that an accident may occur. Maybe some preventive measures should be taken, someone should be alerted that a big vessel is coming in, just in case an incident may happen that would call for emergency measures.

The other requirement in this particular act would increase the bond requirement to \$5,000. I want to point out that under compulsory state pilotage, the Captain, the Master of the vessel, is required to take a state pilot, he has no choice. And under Admiralty Law, the pilot is responsible for his negligence. Of course, most cases, with a \$500 bond, in most cases, even

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

with a \$5,000 - this is insignificant, if the problem arose. But we feel that the bond should be increased, the vessels are being increased, every time there's even a minor accident, the damages are severe. And we feel it should be increased, and I worked with the pilots, and I could tell you, it's almost impossible to get a \$500 bond. I mean, most of the surety companies do not have such low bonds. However, this is something that we feel is something that could probably be worked out. This would authorize the Commission to assign pilots when an emergency exists. Now, the reason this was put in actually is to protect the pilots. Now, the Commission has a two-fold responsibility. The Commission licenses the pilots, and also they license as many as they deem necessary, and of course immediately, the pilots don't want any additional pilots licensed, because in effect, what it would do is to reduce their earnings. Now in New London harbor, we have three licensed pilots, I think all of them are here. Now, if they went home or were in an automobile accident, who would pilot the vessels? This would make a provision where a pilot from another area, in an emergency, could be called upon to pilot. This way a pilot would be available without increasing the number of pilots, and in effect protecting the present pilots.

Another thing that we feel should be, which is in all other states, would require licensed pilots to submit complete reports to the Commission of their earnings every three months. There is one amendment that we would like, in this bill that we have, presently in our Boating Commission law, and this is the right of the Commission to subpoena records, hold meetings which we feel should carry over also in this bill, in case the Commission wants to conduct an investigation. That is all, I'd be glad to answer any questions.

Sen. Gunther: Commissioner, the remark was made before about classifying this with the operation in the waters of the state. This is the broadened coverage of pilot control - do you have any sentiments on that?

Mr. Chalecki: This should broaden, this should contain all waters, because if an accident happens three miles out, this is approximately where the pilots go to pick up their vessels. It would require that they go out a couple of miles more. For example, it would mean half of the northern part of Long Island Sound. As far as New London is concerned, it extends out now only three miles, which is it, so it would not affect New London too much. New Haven harbor, Connecticut's jurisdiction goes out fourteen miles, quite a bit, and Bridgeport harbor goes out about nine miles. Of course, what this would mean, and there is similar legislation in New York, would be that the entire Long Island Sound would be controlled. Now I want to point out that vessels are licensed, but at the present time, a foreign vessel can come to this port, and the only time that they are required to take a licensed pilot is at the harbor. So, therefore, on the other hand, I want to point out that many of them do pick up a pilot in Newport, a coast pilot, because they know that there are many hazards. And also I want to point out that we got into this act, where it says "harbors", it's very hard to get a definition of a harbor, and I'm thinking now particularly of New London, that they're recommending that it be dredged up further. Now, if it goes up toward Montville, is that the harbor? Under this act, we would control them. Also in case there is an off-shore mooring buoy, where a lot of oil companies would like to have a station out there that they could point oil, it would also control this. But the most important thing is that it would enable us, the Commission, to get cooperation with New York authorities to control Long

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 24, 1971

Island Sound as far as vessels are concerned.

Rep. Matthews: I am a little confused as to how you keep having men available. You don't have an apprentice program, where do you get additional men to serve on these boats? Why don't we have an apprentice program?

Mr. Chalecki: Well, of course, at the present time, there are eight licensed pilots, and of course, as I think I pointed out to you before, we are doing this out of our own fund for motor boat registration fees, and ideally, it would be nice to come up with a standard apprenticeship program, but I would say that the, it would be costly to operate. I might add that the groups themselves - out of the eight pilots, there are two associations - the New London association has a person in mind that they are training for New London harbor. And the New Haven Pilots Association has a person in mind. But this is the problem that the Commission may have to face up with, and there's provision in this act that, if the individual meets its federal requirements of a Master's license, which there are several around, there are several that have come to me that want to work for Boating, because they want, I mean, even recreational boating. This bill would require local licensed pilots to train them to meet the local conditions. The problem that you bring up is a problem, we feel that because of the limited number, we feel that this would be the best way to handle it. Now, usually what happens in New York, where they have about 150 pilots, you know generally it happens with any apprenticeship program, the apprentices do all the dirty work. They take the pilot boat out, they clean the boat, and they do this for ten years, and then they finally make a decent day's wage. Of course, this is it. But if at all possible, and I would welcome suggestions from anybody, and if we can come up with an apprenticeship program that is fair to everyone, now this is the problem, where everybody, anybody is free to enter who wants a chance at the job, we would certainly listen to recommendations.

Sen. Eddy: I have one quick question. I think I just heard you say we have a total of eight pilots, so this bill is being aimed at eight individuals?

Mr. Chalecki: Eight pilots, yes, at the present time, sir.

Mr. Sprenkel: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Terry Sprenkel, I'm the Town Manager of the town of South Windsor, and I am here to speak in support of a bill introduced by Rep. Donnelly, 46th District, of which South Windsor is a municipality. This is H.B. 7747, AN ACT CONCERNING GRANTS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR MUNICIPAL RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. Favorable committee action and passage by the General Assembly will permit the state and the municipalities to avail themselves of both state and federal funds for the improvement and development of recreational and open space lands throughout our state and municipalities.

Past actions of the General Assembly, in adopting present legislation, wisely and properly placed expenditures of state and federal funds for open space programs solely on land acquisition. The current enabling legislation passed by the General Assembly provided for funding of land acquisition programs through the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. This decision to limit granting to land acquisition was based on the recommendations and goals of the well-known 1961 Whyte Report that was sanctioned by