

STATE OF CONNECTICUT



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

James M. Thomas  
Commissioner

Lieutenant Edwin S. Henion  
Chief of Staff

February 15, 2011

Rep. Stephen Dargan, Co-Chairman  
Sen. Joan Hartley, Co-Chairman  
Public Safety and Security Committee  
Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106

**SB 931 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEFINITION OF HOISTING EQUIPMENT**

**The Department of Public Safety opposes this bill.**

- 1) By lowering the weight and reach requirements, the types of equipment that will fall under regulation by Raised Bill 931 will vastly increase the scope of the hoisting equipment being regulated.
  - a. This would allow a person who operates a 500 lb capacity, motorized lift at a small contractors' yard, to now be licensed to operate a large excavator or rough terrain, telescopic forklift, thus creating a 2 fold problem; It would now **require** the hoisting operator at the small, private contracting company to get this license to operate this light duty equipment, which is presently not necessary, and at the same time it would allow him to operate that heavy duty equipment, which he may not be able to handle, because he is not properly trained on it.
    - i. This is creating a safety hazard as the two are not comparable pieces of machinery.
    - ii. The Department of Public Safety is open to reducing the weight and reach thresholds, but not without thorough research to see what equipment and industry affects this would have.
      - 1. An area being looked into is the possibility of creating a similar licensing system to that of a Commercial Drivers License; Different classes of licenses for different minimum and maximum weight and reach standards.

2. Similarly, the equipment would need to be categorized as well, so as to not create an extreme hazard by issuing a blanket license. A 500 lb capacity, motorized lift at a small, private contracting company, cannot be compared to the 10 ton capacity excavator. As it is now, there is one "Hoisting License" that covers all equipment.
- 2) As to the grandfather clause, this opens the floodgates allowing those who have obtained licensing under less than desirable regulation to keep that license.
    - a. If we allow a grandfather clause, which provides approximately 2 years for operators to properly obtain, through a testing process established by OSFM, which demonstrates competency, this would be more desirable.
  - 3) The fiscal impact of this proposed bill on the Office of the State Fire Marshal clerical staff would be significant.
    - a. The clerical staff, which consists of one civilian processing tech is already behind on licensing every theater in the state, which is due in February, every explosive truck, which is due in February, and from March to November, every carnival, amusement, and circus display that is set up. In addition to the above licenses, this processing tech is also responsible for issuing over 4000 licenses and permits, annually, to explosive blasters, transporters, handlers, manufacturers, and those who store explosives, commercial fireworks shooters, special affects shooters, and those who have storage facilities for pyrotechnics.
  - 4) There would be a fiscal impact on Connecticut businesses, industry and manufacturing facilities by imposing a licensing requirement for equipment that is commonly used within small businesses, that was not previously required.

Sincerely,

  
James M. Thomas  
COMMISSIONER