

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SA 67-381

Act Number:	381	Year:	1967
Bill Number:	SB 402	Pages	
Senate Pages:	1999-2001		3
House Pages:	5076-5078		3
Committee:	Water Resources 77-105		29
		Page Total:	35

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2012

S-66

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1967

VOL. 12

PART 4

1566-2035

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Mr. President, this bill merely changes the date and the place of the annual meeting of the Savings Bank of New London. It's a good bill and I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on the acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill? As many who are in favor signify by saying, "aye". Contrary minded? The ayes have it and the bill is passed.

CLERK:

Cal. No. 1215 File No. 1386 Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Cities and Boroughs. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 477. An Act Concerning the Keeping of Town Records in Books.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This merely updates the existing statutes in relation to the Town Clerks. It's a good bill and ought to pass.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on the acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. As many as are in favor, will signify by saying, "aye". Contrary minded? The ayes have it, bill is passed.

CLERK:

Cal. No. 1216 File No. 1389 Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Finance Substitute for Senate Bill No. 402. An Act Establishing a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority.

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill is almost self-explanatory but not quite. For those of us who come from Southeastern Connecticut, I'm sure we feel that this will perhaps, be one of the most important bills to be considered at this session of the Legislature. In that, it is before us for the purpose of conserving, preserving and diverting the waters of our areas of their most productive use. This bill provides for the creation of a Water Authority, and each Town, in the 17 Towns, in the Region will be sending one Representative to what is known as an Advisory Board. Each one of these representatives, will serve for a period of 2 years without compensation, and they in turn will pick a 5 member Governing Board of this Authority. Whose members shall serve for a period 5 years, withing the region and not more than three shall be members of the same political party. These people, these 5 people shall have the task of running, they'll have the authority to acquire land, construct reservoirs, lay and maintain the necessary pipes for the purpose of providing water to the area. The Authority will have the right to sell water at wholesale or retail and it will be a perpetual authority. The bill calls for an appropriation of \$250,000, for the purpose of getting this Authority off the ground, sot to speak. But also provides that as soon as the bonds are floated, this money will be repaid to the State. I might say that this is not the first time that a bill of this nature has come before this assembly. In fact, there has been two or t three previous bills. But this bill is far better than any we have had before. The objections that have been raised in previous bills, have been eliminated. I'm certain that this bill is enacted, and I think it will be, it will insure that there will be an adequate supply of water to the Southeastern Connecticut area for many decades to come. It is an excellent bill, Mr. President,

many decades to come. I think this is an excellent bill, Mr. President, and I recommend its passage.

SENATOR STANLEY:

Mr. President, as one of the sponsors, along with the Senator from the 18th and the Senator from the 20th, I think it's appropriate to say that this is perhaps the most meaningful legislation for New London County, to come out of this session. I think, also, that my colleague would agree with me, that credit, where credit is due and this represents a great deal of effort, put forth by the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency, in the 17 Towns, that have representation on it. The Agency has worked hard. This will represent the first positive program from the many planning efforts they have made. It is a good piece of legislation, and I repeat perhaps, the most meaningful for Eastern Connecticut come out of this session. I hope it passes.

SENATOR JANOVIC:

Mr. President, I rise to favor this bill. I, too, feel it is one of the finest pieces of legislation that has come before this body, for the future growth of Southeastern Connecticut. I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on the acceptance of the favorable report of the Joint Committee on Finance, and the passage of this bill. As many who are in favor will signify by saying, "aye". Contrary minded? The ayes have it and the bill is passed.

CLERK:

Cal. No. 1217 File No. 1390 Favorable report of the Joint Committee on General Law. Senate Bill No. 10000 An Act Concerning Unfair Sales Practices.

H-94

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1967

VOL. 12

PART 11

4937 - 5501

26-5

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

MR. CROMBIE (44th):

We are very happy to endorse this bill. I'll agree that it's been a long time coming but it's here.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Those in favor? Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1455, Substitute for S.B. 402, An Act Establishing a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority.

MR. METTLER (96th):

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. METTLER (96th):

This bill creates the Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority which will improve the health, welfare and prosperity of the people located within the southeastern Connecticut planning region particularly, and of the state of Connecticut generally. It is a good bill, a rather complex one, but one that will add to the prosperity and health of all the citizens of our state and I urge its passage.

MR. PLATT (121st):

I'm happy to rise and support this bill. This bill was passed through this House in the last session and I'm sure there is more need for it now than there was then. I hope it has clear

26-6

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

sailing the rest of the way. I'm very happy to support the bill.

MR. ROSE (69th):

I rise to support this bill. It is a very important bill for my section of the state. It has been a long time coming and gone through a great deal of agony in the process. I think a great deal of credit must be given to previous legislators who originally introduced this legislation and it's finally been worked out to the point where it's acceptable. It's a fine bill and I hope it passes.

MR. AXELROD (65th):

I rise also in support of this bill. Of all of the legislation that has come before us in this term affecting southeastern Connecticut in general and the town of Groton in particular, I think this one piece of legislation is the most farsighted and most important piece of legislation to come before us. It will set up a system of water supply for the 17 towns in southeastern Connecticut so as to provide for their future water need. We have all heard throughout this session of the water shortages throughout the state. I think that this piece of legislation will be of more benefit to southeastern Connecticut over the years than anything to come before us. To Groton, which I represent, this piece of legislation is going to meet a need that has been pressing for many years, the need of a water shortage which we know would be coming in the next 3 to 5 years. I want to commend the committee that heard this bill, brought it out with a favorable report. We need it, we need it badly.

26-7

Tuesday, June 6, 1967

MR. HOLDRIDGE (63rd):

I heartily endorse this bill. With three large plants in our area they need this water very badly. I'm very glad to support this bill.

MR. DUDA (58th):

As a representative from the 58th district which includes four of the towns in this southeastern regional water authority, I join enthusiastically with my colleagues from southeastern Connecticut in endorsing this fine legislation that holds so much for the future of southeastern Connecticut. ~~MRxxLAUDONExx~~

MR. LAUDONE (62nd):

I heartily endorse this particular bill. It has had a very thorough and exhaustive study by the members of the southeastern Connecticut Planning zone. It is a most progressive and forward looking legislation, and it will benefit not only southeastern Connecticut but the entire state of Connecticut.

MRS. ERB (66th):

I too wish to endorse this proposal.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor? Opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 1456, Substitute for S.B. 897, An Act concerning Commitment of Neglected or Uncared-for Children.

MR. KING (48th):

I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

WATER
RESOURCES

1967

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Senator W. B. Stanley, presiding

Members present: Senators: Stanley, Janovic
 Representatives: Axelrod, Pawlak, Platt,
 Gutmann, Taintor, terKuile, Clarke,
 Chagnon, Ciarlone, Green

Chr. Stanley: I now declare the hearings open, and propose that we hear collectively S.B. 402, H.B. 3875 and H.B. 2804.

S.B. 402 (Senators Palmer, Stanley, Janovic) AN ACT ESTABLISHING A SOUTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT WATER AUTHORITY

H.B. 3875 (Rep. Cohen) AN ACT ESTABLISHING A SOUTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT WATER AUTHORITY.

H.B. 2804 (Rep. Rose) AN ACT ESTABLISHING A SOUTHEASTERN CONNECTICUT WATER AUTHORITY.

Philip F. Clark, Chairman

Southeastern Conn. Regional Planning Agency: This agency represents the seventeen-town region encompassed in the proposed Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority's district of operation. After five years of studying the problem of providing an adequate future water supply to our rapidly growing region, my Agency has voted unanimously to support S.B. 402, H.B. 3875 and H.B. 2804.

Briefly, the reasons why we support the creation of a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority are the following:

First, Southeastern Connecticut is facing its most rapid period of growth in the remaining years of this century. Our population is expected to rise from the present level of 200,000 people to 450,000 in the next 33 years. Water Consumption by the year 2000 will probably be five times what it was in 1960.

Second, the Metcalf & Eddy regional water supply study of 1962, an abstract of which I will file with the committee, disclosed that Southeastern Connecticut has adequate potential water resources within its own borders to meet its expected water supply needs through the remainder of this century provided these potential water sources are conserved and developed in an orderly, coordinated manner for the benefit of the region as a whole.

MARCH 8, 1967

The Metcalf & Eddy study concluded that a regional approach through a public benefit authority was needed to assure an adequate future water supply in our region.

Third, nine major studies conducted by my Agency over the past five years as part of the preparation of a regional plan have confirmed the findings of the Metcalf & Eddy study. I am filing copies of these reports with the committee. Our studies have pointed up the fact that the advance of development and the spread of water pollution have already seriously affected 21 of the 46 potential reservoir sites identified in the Metcalf & Eddy survey. Since our region contains some of the fastest growing towns in Connecticut, the loss of additional potential sites could result in serious water problems in the future. We have also concluded as a result of our studies that an expanding population and economy in Southeastern Connecticut will eventually require the development of reservoirs in presently rural portions of the region and the construction of major water transmission lines tying together the 36 municipal and private water distribution systems now serving the region. Since these actions will of necessity involve more than one municipality, we believe that a public regional water authority, containing representation from all communities in Southeastern Connecticut, offers the best means of meeting the area's water supply needs.

Fourth, as a public agency, the proposed regional water authority should be eligible for federal open space grants to assist in acquiring necessary reservoir sites and for federal grants to assist in constructing dams and water transmission lines.

Finally, we believe that the existence of a regional water authority will be of immeasurable help in insuring an orderly, economically sound growth throughout Southeastern Connecticut in the years to come.

In addition to these major reasons why my agency supports the creation of a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority, we believe that the provisions in the bill providing for cooperation with fire departments and permitting the use of the authority's water and land for conservation and recreation purposes are desirable, progressive secondary benefits for Southeastern Connecticut.

3.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

The Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency respectfully urges that your committee recommend adoption of S.B. 402, H.B. 3875 and H.B. 2804.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to file with the committee a favorable report from the State Department of Health and letters of support from eight communities that were not able to be represented here today.

We have some gentlemen here from varying organizations. Mr. Clinton, would you come forward.

William W. Clinton, General Manager

Groton Dept. of Utilities: The City of Groton obtains its water supply from the Great Brook watershed by means of a system of impounding reservoirs. This reservoir system has a combined usable storage of 1,124 million gallons and provides an estimated dependable yield of 8.5 million gallons per day. The water is treated in a filtration plant and is pumped into the distribution system. At the present time, the system supplies a population in excess of 28,000 persons, The United States Submarine base, Chas. Pfizer Company and the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corporation. The economy of the entire Southeastern Connecticut region is dependent to a large degree, upon these three operations. It is important that Groton meet their future water requirements.

Because Groton has held certain water rights in the Towns of Groton and Ledyard since 1903, an orderly plan of development was followed with initial construction occurring in the Town of Ledyard in 1955. In 1966, construction of the Morgan Pond Reservoir in the Town of Ledyard was undertaken and will be completed in early spring of 1967. Construction of the Billings-Avery Brook Diversion project in the Town of Ledyard will be undertaken and completed in 1967. Together, these projects will add 3.6 million gallons per day to the dependable yield of the Groton system, raising the system yield to 12.1 million gallons per day, which will meet all anticipated water requirements until 1972.

With the completion of these two projects, the City of Groton will have utilized all of the major available water supply sites in the

4.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL
WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Towns of Ledyard and Groton which are economically feasible to develop. By the year 1970, the next water supply project which will supply water to the Groton System should be under construction. On this basis, it is indicative that engineering and land acquisition for this project be completed prior to 1970.

If the Groton system is to meet the water requirements of its populace and industry beyond 1972, an orderly plan of developing available water supply sites must be devised. The regional water authority proposed in S.B. #402 would accomplish just this. Groton would then be sharing the cost of developing and transporting water supplies with other participating municipalities in the District.

The main advantage which Groton would derive from participation in the proposed regional program would be the increased opportunity of obtaining additional water supplies as they are required. By using supplies developed by a regional water authority, Groton would not have to make capital outlays to develop additional supplies on an independent basis that could not be used to capacity for several years. Through regional development, a more efficient use of supplies within the District could be realized to the benefit of all municipalities participating in the regional program.

We believe that a regional water authority is essential to provide adequate water supply for the municipalities within the Southeastern Connecticut Planning Region; and therefore, S.B. #402 has the full support of the City of Groton.

Robert Elliott

Thermos Division/King Seeley Thermos - Norwich: I would just like to express our support for these bills under consideration because we believe they are in the best interest of the people and industry in Southeastern Connecticut.

Clarence B. Sharp, Mayor

City of Groton: I've been associated with this ever since it first started. I think it is an excellent idea. I think it should progress as rapidly as possible for the interest of Southeastern Connecticut. Mr. Clinton has expressed a few precise words for the Commission. I think it

5.
WEDNESDAY P.M.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

is one of the finest things that could happen to Southeastern Connecticut. Thank you very much.

Charles P. deBiasi, Director

New London Public Works: People, especially in this part of the country, take water for granted and when a nice, heavy rain occurs, become vested with the feeling that water is free; however freely it falls from the sky, to capture this freely falling water, insure its potability and conduct it to the user requires considerable engineering knowledge, years of advance planning and an organization with extensive know how.

In this area, the most practical method of developing a water supply requires first, a watershed, and secondly, a proper location on the watershed where the topography permits the economical construction of an impounding dam. Because of these two conditions, most water companies' watersheds and reservoirs are outside of the distribution system and often located in several different towns. This often results in a town having a water supply reservoir within its political boundaries but the water is transported to and used in a different town or towns.

Since water supply systems, because of their very nature, must cross town lines, it follows that in order to insure an equitable distribution of available water an authority should be established which has the power to acquire water supply and distribute same over as large an area as practical. A water authority covering an area such as the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Area will be able to inter-connect all the water supply systems, present and future, into one unified grid, and this will permit the authority to distribute water from watersheds with surplus water to areas which have a shortage of water. This type of grid system is utilized by all electric power producers and distributors.

The City of New London supports and recommends the establishment of a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority, and I am personally confident that in the years to come the people of Southeastern Connecticut will be grateful and thank the 1967 Legislature for having had the foresight to insure adequate water supply to future generations.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Harvey Mallove, Mayor
New London:

I noticed the remarks made here today for this act concern themselves strictly with the effect of such an authority on Southeastern Connecticut. I don't think that it is fair that we, as people who reside in the Southeastern Connecticut section of the state, refer to this selfishly. If this authority is set up and becomes a vehicle that performs the things that we would like to see it do, it will positively help the State of Connecticut in an area that probably has shown the least total growth of any section of the state. And, if we grow, we will make our state that much more healthier. But when we talked about the question of water, Mr. deBiasi brought out the fact that water is a life line that goes across towns, we then refer to the health and welfare of all of the people of the entire area, and one of the factors that is of great concern to so many people -- and especially this committee -- is the fear of contamination, and so forth.

Now, everybody knows that any time we have a system water rather than the individual well, the water that comes to the individual -- residents or business -- is enclosed in pipes, transmission mains, distribution mains, and so forth. Unfortunately, our entire area, and I'm sure one of the next things that is going to come before your committee is going to be the regional sewer authority, one of the things that is of great concern is the fact that so many people have so much contamination of their own water supply. If we can set up a regional authority that can properly set up a distribution main, we will be, in addition to making the entire area very healthy and very safe, we will therefore be insuring the fact that all of the water will be completely useable, drinkable, good for all forms of industrial purposes, and will enable us to grow so that we can pay the rest of the state some of this great money that we will get in taxes to make our state a better state. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Hugh M. MacKenzie, First Selectman

Town of Waterford: I wish to speak in strong support of S.B. 402. I would like to read into the record a letter addressed to Senator Stanley,

7.
WEDNESDAY P.M.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

Chairman of the Water Resources Committee.

As First Selectman of the Town of Waterford, I want to strongly support Senate Bill 402, which would create a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority.

As a member of the 1963 and 1965 sessions of the Legislature, I have supported earlier versions of this bill. I hope that my appearance here today is not a question of three strikes and out, but three strikes and in.

As Chief Administrator of one of the most rapidly growing towns in Southeastern Connecticut, I believe this bill is the only sure-fire program for establishing a water supply capable of meeting the needs of the increasing demands of these hearings.

I'd like to leave this letter with you and a copy for Senator Janovic and urge my strong support for this very worthy bill.

Stanley Isralite, Executive Vice President

Norwich Area Chamber of Commerce: It is my distinct honor to represent the City of Norwich, and I would like to present you with a certified copy of a Resolution passed by the City Council of Norwich, and representing the President of the City Council, Mr. Sullivan, I will present this Resolution favoring S.B. 402. Also, in order not to be repetitive -- my remarks regarding the Norwich Area Chamber of Commerce's stand and the Norwich Community Development stand on S.B. 402 -- I would just tell you that we are in favor of this legislation. I will give you a documented copy of our remarks which, in keeping with what has been said and to expedite the matter here, I will present this to you.

Pyam Williams, Director

Manufacturers Association of Norwich: As a director, I would like to express the Manufacturers Association of Norwich' desire to see that S.B. 402 and H.B. 3875 receive the approval for passage. This has been duly authorized by a poll of our membership, and I have been informed by the secretary today that the Association is in favor of this bill. I should like to leave a roster of the members of the Manufacturers Association of Norwich.

8.
WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL
WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Mr. Dunning

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics: We, as an industry in Groton, are dependent upon a reliable source of water which we now enjoy in Groton, and we are in favor of this every inch of the way for both bills which are a great step forward in keeping this a live and moving area of the State of Connecticut.

Standish Beebe, Plant Engineer

Chas. Pfizer Company: I think I can perhaps gain a little sympathy if I can remind you of the last four years of drought conditions we had in Southeastern Connecticut. Pfizer uses, at the moment, about four million gallons of water a day, which many small towns don't use. We are continually growing. We've had great plans for the future which, I'm sure will involve more and more water. Water is now furnished by the City of Groton's Utilities Department, and they have done a marvelous job. They didn't close the valve on us once during any of these droughts; but they came pretty close. In fact, we curtailed our operations on more than one occasion, quite seriously, because of a lack of water. Our position is definitely anything that will enhance a supply of good water in Southeastern Connecticut. We are enthusiastically in favor of it, and we, therefore, wish to support S.B. 402.

Thomas Groux

Assistant to the Town Manager - Groton: I'm here on behalf of the Town Council and the other official bodies in the town. The Town of Groton unanimously supports S.B. 402 and directed appearance here at their February 6th meeting. Groton, in the past, has had a serious water shortage to the point where the Groton Utilities Department was advertising that less than a ten-day supply of water remained in Groton's reservoir. The Groton Utilities Department recently completed a reservoir that will provide for the city's water and reservoir storage. Although this additional reservoir capacity could supply the needs of Groton for a decade or more, it is possible that with further substantial growth in Groton, the water supply would not be adequate, and Groton would have to look toward North Stonington, Preston and other towns. In summary, Groton can profit from

9.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

the creation of a regional water authority, and the town unanimously supports this bill as well as the Town Planning Commission unanimously supported this and, I believe, directed a letter to the Regional Planning Agency in this regard also.

Cmdr. Roloff, Public Works Officer

Submarine Base, Groton: The Navy depends upon the City of Groton Utilities Commission for its water requirement which, today, is about one and a half million gallons per day. During the next five years, with another three hundred unit family housing program in '68 and continual growth and new buildings at the Submarine Base, we anticipate an increase of two million gallons in five years. Therefore, the Navy is vitally interested in a good source of economical water for its requirements. We heartedly support this bill.

Marshall Ginther, Managing Director

Chamber of Commerce, Southeastern Connecticut: The entire business community of Southeastern Connecticut is now embarked on an intensive campaign to diversify the economy of that portion of Connecticut because of its present major dependence on military establishments and defense oriented industries.

In recent months, there has been established a Southeastern Connecticut Economic Development Corporation whose sole purpose is to work for the diversification of the economic base of that region.

One of the greatest government helps for this effort, now being made by the business community, would be the establishment of a water authority for the entire region, for the availability of potable water is one of the essential factors in the location of practically every new industry or the expansion of existing industry.

Many of the smaller communities in this region of the state do not now have the tax base or the bonding capacity to provide a public water supply at the present time.

We urge the Water Resources and Flood Control Committee to give a favorable report to S.B. 402 so this essential municipal service

10.

WEDNESDAY P.M. WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

can be provided on a regional basis for the future benefit of all the citizens in the region and the continued promotion of the economy of Southeastern Connecticut

Philip Clark: Prior to this hearing, I was passed a letter addressed to me as Chairman of the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency. May I read this?

Chr. Stanley: Certainly.

Philip Clark: This is from the City of Norwich, Department of Public Utilities:

In reply to your letter of March 1, 1967, this is to advise you that as General Manager of the Norwich Department of Public Utilities, I am in full support of S.B. 402 which would create a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority. Although the City of Norwich is fortunate in that it has surplus water at the present time, it is my feeling that future water commitments in the southeast area make the formation of this authority an absolute necessity. Most authorities state that within twenty years the northeastern United States' water consumption will far exceed its present supply. For this reason, it is necessary to start thinking of full utilization of water resources.

CITY OF NORWICH, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES,
Robert E. Grimshaw, General Manager.

Mr. Chairman, that completes the individuals and firms that Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning has lined up to appear today.

Sen. Palmer: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you've explained to these people that the reason there are only two people up here is no indication of the importance of this bill but because the House is in session and the House members are momentarily tied up.

I am speaking in favor of S.B. 402, which I think is probably the best bill that we can obtain at the present time to serve the purposes of the Southeastern Connecticut area. It may not be a perfect bill, and in fact I'm sure that everyone in the Southeastern Connecticut area is not pleased by this bill.

But, as I said before, I think it is the best possible bill we can get at this time. It is certainly an improvement over the bill that was in the Legislature two years ago and did not pass, and one of the areas of improvement is that this bill more fairly compensates those people and those towns, particularly the towns, for revenue in lieu of taxes than the previous bill did. There is one change I think should be made in this bill, and I hope that your committee will perhaps come out with a substitute bill to provide that water companies serving in excess of three thousand people would be exempt from condemnation powers of this authority. The present bill calls for five thousand. It would seem to me that any water company that serves three thousand should be excluded from the provisions of this bill, and I'm sure that your committee intends to do that. I would only say that this bill at least create some control among the various towns involved in this region -- give them at least a representative on the governing board -- and I think this question of water is too serious a problem to be delayed any longer. You have heard very many and important people representing industries that employ perhaps 50 or 75 or 100 thousand people here today asking that action be taken. We know that water is in short supply. It's a priceless asset, and we can ill-afford to have it wasted. We've got to keep the industry that we have in this area, and without water, they can not operate. We not only want to keep that industry -- we want to see it expand, and we want to see additional industry locate in this region; and I think that this is a vital bill to accomplish this, and I certainly urge your committee to report on it favorably.

Joseph Gill, Commissioner

Agriculture & Natural Resources: I'm speaking in favor of S.B. 402, establishing a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority. I would like to make it abundantly clear that I am speaking as a conservationist and as Commissioner. One of the things that past members of the administration must be very careful of is that they don't speak for () of funding of various programs. That is handled by our Department of Financial Control, and should funds be found available for the necessary

12.

WEDNESDAY P.M.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

funding of this program, I would like to give a little background on the need and the opportunity for creating such an authority to take care of the anticipated growth of the State of Connecticut.

The State of Connecticut is a beautiful area with an average annual rainfall between 40 and 50 inches a year -- except when it is during the past five years -- I realize it is a little below that. We have three million acres in this state, and in just three years we are going to have three million people on those three million acres; and it has taken us over three hundred years to get those people here. But, the awesome fact is in just 35 years we are going to have twice as many people in the State of Connecticut. Southeastern Connecticut and New London County is fortunate in one respect. You do have open space. You do have area. You do have water potential there for the future development of our state. And, with the orderly planning for the future development, for the year 2000 and 2010, must be done today. And probably the most essential ingredient that we must have for the development of this area is adequate supplies of good, clean water. I don't know of a more propitious time for, on a state level, to assist in establishing a water authority, and I congratulate Senator Palmer, Senator Stanley and Senator Janovic for the insight in a very good bill, that I can see. There are probably some exceptions as Senator Palmer said -- adjustments to be made -- but the open spaces that it will insure, the recreation that it will provide are things that we, in our department, are vitally concerned with. I'm happy to add our endorsement to the bill in principle so far as the need for it is concerned.

Chr. Stanley:

Commissioner, I would like to ask one question. You played no small part in assisting in drafting the administration bill on clean water, and in that bill it calls for development of all potential. Would you, in your judgment say that this was a normal continuation of the spirit of that legislation?

Commissioner Gill: Yes, I would.

Chr. Stanley: Fine. Thank you, Commissioner. Is there anyone else who would speak in favor?

William R. Sebastian, First Selectman

Town of Preston: I have the other members of the Board with me, and we are here to endorse this bill. We understand that probably the most affected town in the state would be the Town of Preston, but we also realize the fact that in order for our town and the other towns in our area to grow, water is really an essential thing. Thank you.

Robert C. Young

Connecticut Development: I am the Regional Planning Agency Coordinator for the Connecticut Development Commission which has voted to support the legislation proposed by House Bill 2804, House Bill 3875 and Senate Bill 402.

Two years ago the Development Commission favored similar legislation; we support it again for very much the same reasons. We do not believe that the Southeastern Connecticut Planning Region can develop along sound lines and provide for the growing needs of industry and housing with a multitude of fragmented water systems, many of which may be in basic competition for the same limited resources. And, we do think the proposed authority is feasible.

Geographically, the Southeastern Connecticut Planning Region is well suited for an authority of this type. We feel strongly that water facilities -- or any community facilities for that matter -- must be developed in accordance with overall objectives stated in a comprehensive plan. We believe that this will be the case in Southeastern Connecticut because: (1) the district of the proposed authority is coterminous with the Southeastern Connecticut Planning Region; (2) the structure of the authority provides for a close relationship with the towns; (3) the quality and progress of regional planning in the area has been outstanding. The bill itself, I would like to point out, came only after a number of studies had been completed by both the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency and others.

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Our staff has not investigated all of the detailed provisions of this bill, nor do we feel it our responsibility to do so. My remarks here are brief in order not to take time away from those more directly concerned, but the Commission does want to be recorded in favor of the bill.

John Svetz

North Stonington: I am speaking as an individual. I would like to say that if this bill would infringe upon any rights of any town, I suggest that it be opposed, but if the bill can be made so that it would benefit the area, I would definitely want to be on record that we favor this bill, and I would like also to endorse Senator Palmer's statements on the bill.

Cole Wilde:

It is difficult to criticize bills attempting to recognize the valid need, but these measures contain hidden dangers perhaps not visualized by the sponsors... Provisions that require adequate water treatment facilities so as to insure recreational use and develop water supply basins are lacking. Further,...

Chr. Stanley:

You're speaking in favor, Sir, is that right?

Mr. Wilde:

Yes, I am.

Further, there is no provision for minimum flow requirements as needed to maintain the value of the natural water courses for purposes of recreation and aquatic life. Section 11 does not offer any real safeguard that lands and waters acquired by the authority would be open to hunting and fishing or other forms of recreational use. It is common knowledge that the State Health Department is opposed to any real recreational use of watersheds and water supply reservoirs. Further, no consideration is given to the recreational use of lands and waters acquired for essential reservoir sites, but not developed for water supply purposes. The authority will have an absolute minimum of state regulation as the bill provides that permits, licenses, consent, or other authorization, present or future, shall not be required to be obtained from any board, commission, or other agency of the state except the Water Resources Commission and the State Department

of Health in order for the authority to acquire, operate, maintain, improve or extend any of its properties. Thus, it would appear that our wild-life resources and habitat could be destroyed without serious consideration or mitigation. While subject to interpretation, it could even mean the dam, without provisions for fishways, could be built on a more important stream system. The Board recognizes the valid and pressing need to develop and implement realistic plans which provide for the future domestic and industrial water needs of our citizens and our industrial base economy but feels that such program should also recognize all other equally valid uses of water. We offer our services to the Committee in resolving these areas of concern. The Board registers in support of S.B. 402, H. B. 2804 and H.B. 3875 with the condition the Committee seek to resolve the deficiency cited above.

Chr. Stanley: If provision is made for fishways and so forth, this would meet with your whole-hearted support? Would it be a fair appraisal, too, that if the reservoirs that would be developed were not developed that some of the benefits that you would like to see, if they were developed, wouldn't exist anyway?

Mr. Wilde: I think the main point is that with adequate water treatment these areas could be opened for public recreation.

Chr. Stanley: Right. But, if they are left undeveloped, isn't it true that they could similarly become polluted and not be available for anything? This is just a case of judgment.

Mr. Wilde: I don't really think so.

Chr. Stanley: Is there anyone else who would speak in favor?

Anthony Carboni, Chairman - Legislative Committee
Southeastern Conn. Regional Planning Agency: I would like to mention that the committee and I did a great deal of the detail work on this particular bill. Needless to say, we are wholeheartedly in favor of it. I do want to point out that the change recommended by Senator Palmer has been, or is to be, included in a substitute bill. In other

WEDNESDAY P.M.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

words, this will be changed from the five thousand to the three thousand. There are two or three other small items that are also going to be changed, and I would say here again that we feel this bill is what is needed for the area. We'd like to go on record in support of it. I personally would like to go on record in support of this bill not only as the Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency, but also as the First Selectman of the Town of Franklin. Thank you.

Mr. Piszczek, First Selectman

Town of Preston: I do wish to speak for water on a regional basis, and I fully support this bill.

Richard Fleming

Town of Preston: I am in favor of S.B. 402.

Chr. Stanley:

Is there anyone else who would register in favor? Is there anyone here who would speak in opposition?

Lee Harris

City of Meriden: I am speaking for the Connecticut State League of Sportsmen and Conservation Clubs. We are taking a stand in opposition to these bills largely for the reasons expressed by Cole Wilde. We are fearful that it would curtail many recreational areas. Commissioner Gill has stated that it would be possible to comply with multiple use plans and so forth for recreational propositions, and the provisions stated by Cole Wilde, if written into the bill, it would relieve us of any opposition to the bill, in my opinion. But, we would like very much to see that written into the bill before it is adopted. We feel it is essential that recreation expand in areas and be provided for, and Southeastern Connecticut provides one of the potential areas for development of further use of recreational purposes. We, as the bill is written, are opposed to it. Thank you.

Chr. Stanley:

Let me ask you this, if I may, Sir. If those provisions were in there, the opposition would not exist, is that correct?

Mr. Harris:

I am of that opinion. I can't speak for the committee, but I am of that opinion, Sir.

17.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Linwood Page, Secretary

New London County League of Sportsmen Clubs: We feel there are ultimate methods of securing this water which we know Groton needs, and badly. But, we do not like to see the recreational areas -- Pachaug State Park in particular -- compromise in any way, because we understand that two or three of the dams are contemplated for that section. If adequate provision were made to guarantee that the recreational use of these lands were taken care of, I don't think there would be any opposition. Otherwise, we would be opposed to it. There is recreational land in Connecticut that is premium, and we have perhaps more than our share of it, but we share it with the rest of the state as recreational land, and we are sure that the rest of the state appreciates that also.

Chr. Stanley: What is the number of membership in your organization?

Mr. Page: We have nine clubs, and they vary in membership from a dozen or fifteen to three or four hundred.

Chr. Stanley: I see. In Southeastern Connecticut it would affect how many members, do you feel?

Mr. Page: All of us. We are all in that section. Many of us work for Electric Boat, and we do appreciate the need for water, but we hope that it can be obtained without closing off any substantial open space.

William E. Glynn
Connecticut Water

Works Association: I wish, on behalf of the Association, to appear in opposition to these bills. Although there are several specifics in the bill that we object to, I would just like to comment on four general areas.

We first object to the condemnation powers over other utilities -- whether they be private water companies or municipally owned water companies -- as are provided for in the various subsections of Section 14 of the bill. We also point out and we object to those provisions which would enable the authority to make payments to towns in lieu of taxes. We feel that the taxation should be as it is on other utilities. The

situation could very well be created, and would be created, whereby a source of water supply in one town would be serving other towns, and yet the people in the first town would not be getting the revenues to which they would otherwise be entitled. Further, in effect, by such a procedure, they would be, as taxpayers, underwriting some of the costs which would bring about the benefit to other towns.

We would also point out and object to the fact that there is nothing in the bill providing for consultation with local planning and zoning authorities. There is not any authority for the Public Utilities Commission and, traditionally, the public utilities has served a great need and afforded an opportunity for individual consumers and users to have a body to whom they can complain over elements of their service, or lack of service, or in any way they felt a particular utility was not carrying out its function in the public interest. There is also in the bill no power given to the Water Resources Commission and, of course, as was indicated earlier, there is before the Legislature at this time the administration bill on the Clean Water Task Force. Nor is there in the bill any function to be performed by the State Department of Health; and these three agencies that I've mention -- Public Utilities Commission, Water Resources Commission and State Department of Health -- have been, historically, intimately connected with the use, control and security of water in our state.

We feel also and object to the portion of the bill which indicates that nothing that the authority in order to accomplish or invest money must be assured that the revenues would be sufficient to justify this expenditure. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the authority would not be too far removed from the problems that some of the private water companies now have in having a desire to accomplish certain improvements and certain objectives and yet, because of their limitations on revenues, are not able to accomplish these.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that there

19.

WEDNESDAY P.M.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

are other bills before the Legislature. I refer specifically to S.B. 1488, which you have filed which would call for a study of existing water rights, and in the House there is a similar bill, 2852, revealing law relating to water use. There is also a bill, H.B. 2276, which has to do with integrated water reservoir systems in the state, and it would seem to us that these evidence an approach to this problem which seem to be a more logical approach when we consider that Connecticut is a relatively small state. As Commissioner Gill has indicated, we're blessed with still a large portion of our state which is green. We're a heavily urbanized and industrialized state, and the problems of water supplies -- adequate supplies of clean water -- although in recent years they were particularly critical in some areas of the state; nevertheless it is a state-wide problem.

I submit also, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this authority would be a special district and further, the state is making marked progress in the development of an overall policy, and where this overall policy, at least at the present time, is looking toward the Water Resources Commission and the Health Department to some extent for the implementation and establishment of this policy, this special district could very well in the future have some of the detrimental characteristics which special districts are noted for. Once they are created they become more or less a power unto themselves. There are great difficulties in achieving coordination with other agencies and with other all purpose (area-wide) agencies, and I think we could very well be building all sorts of difficulties into the effective implementation of a state-wide policy by the creation of a water authority of this nature limited to one area of our state. I would ask permission to submit a memorandum more succinctly outlining some of the points that I've made here in this presentation and possibly commenting on some of the smaller aspects.

Chr. Stanley:

When would you have this presentation ready?

- Mr. Glynn: We could have it within the next day or so.
- Chr. Stanley: That would be fine. May I ask you a few questions? Now, you represent...
- Mr. Glynn: The Connecticut Water Works Association which is an association of water companies both private and municipal in the state.
- Chr. Stanley: How big a factor in Southeastern Connecticut is this association? How big a capital commitment do they have?
- Mr. Glynn: I believe following me will be representatives of the Connecticut Water Company, which is one of the major water companies in that area. That is the principle member of our Association, although I believe the Groton Water Company is a member of the Association and Mystic Valley, and there are several others that are members.
- Chr. Stanley: Would it be a fair question to ask have you any vested interest, so to speak, in the development of water in that area of these private companies in the future?
- Mr. Glynn: I'm not sure I understand your question.
- Chr. Stanley: Your comments were very noble in the protective nature of the people and the good of the area. I wonder if there is any commercial development that your organization anticipates that would prompt such patriotism?
- Mr. Glynn: I'm not quite sure I could characterize my remarks as being patriotic except that I love Connecticut, and I suppose love of one's state is patriotic. But, I would say that if there is a need to be fulfilled, then ways and means should be found to fulfill the need. On the other hand, I think that there are legitimate interests of private water companies and that concern should be paramount in not going so far to fulfill one need that other benefits are unnecessarily destroyed. And, basically, our objection to the condemnation powers here are with the expression of the concern that certain interest may be overridden when it is not necessary to do that in order to accomplish the objective.
- Chr. Stanley: In developing this further, do you think

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

that those companies that you represent are prepared to make a total commitment that would serve the 17, and shortly 18, towns in the area on a total basis?

Mr. Glynn: I would prefer that that question be addressed to the representatives of the Connecticut Water Company who will be testifying, I believe, in opposition.

Rep. Axelrod: Do members of your Association and private water companies have the power of condemnation?

Mr. Glynn: They do.

Rep. Axelrod: If those members were to make a commitment to develop a water supply within this area, do they continue to have a power of condemnation?

Mr. Glynn: Yes, I think so. I think that would be essential.

Rep. Axelrod: Do you feel that it is just as essential for such a proposed regional authority to have a power of condemnation?

Mr. Glynn: Well, I think that...You see, the power here in this bill is the power of condemnation over another body having the like power. I'm a Democrat, but I don't necessarily believe that government should do everything, if it can be done adequately by private enterprise.

Rep. Axelrod: Assume that there is a situation where some towns have an overabundance of a water supply within this area, and others are lacking. How else, other than by regional approach, can this problem be solved?

Mr. Glynn: I think that possibly the approach that is being pursued by the state through the Clean Water Bill would solve it. In other words, a state-wide approach...We're not a state like so many other states with great areas with great divergency in the regions within the state.

Rep. Axelrod: You mean with the state taking over all the water supplies?

- Mr. Glynn: I think that the state would establish a policy looking to the long range and what are needs are as a state in the future. I can see right now, for instance, that there are certain areas of the Southeastern Connecticut Planning regions, and yet we don't know at this point in any great detail where our population growth is going to take place, and it might very well be that at some time in the not too distant future the economic areas of the state would be somewhat different than they are now.
- Rep. Axelrod: Which members of your Association in the region are affected by this power of condemnation?
- Mr. Glynn: The Connecticut Water Company is one.
- Rep. Axelrod: Are there any others besides the Connecticut Water Company now affected by this power of eminent domain within the region.
- Mr. Glynn: Every member of the Association is potentially affected. If the state were to pursue the policy of creating regional water districts throughout the state patterned after the one envisioned by this bill, rather than to establish a state-wide policy, there could potentially be every water company within the state that would be subject to condemnation by government authority.
- Rep. Pawlak: Do you anticipate that the state might intrude on the affairs and prerogatives of already established water companies in other parts of the state where there is no need for an authority to be established?
- Mr. Glynn: I think this is a danger, in all honesty. I think that the history of special districts in this country is quite often apt to happen.
- Chr. Stanley: Do you have some examples of those districts that haven't worked out favorably?
- Mr. Glynn: Well, I think if we take a look at the New York Port Authority as one example that is not responsive at all to the people, and they are in controversy with the states of New Jersey and New York where a special district has become so powerful that even the City of New York has problems.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

- Chr. Stanley: I wonder if that is implied between personalities and opinions. They seem to serve the needs of the people. But, I mean in the areas of water authorities...Are there any that you know of that have been established that have not worked out.
- Mr. Glynn: I can't answer that. I do know that there is controversy between private water companies and public authorities almost wherever they exist.
- Chr. Stanley: I see many representatives here. I'm going to recognize them since they couldn't be here when the hearings started.
- Rep. Erb: I simply wish to go on record in support of H.B. 2804 introduced by Rep. Rose of the 69th District -- an act establishing Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority, and also S.B. 402, dealing with the same subject matter. Thank you very much.
- Rep. Holdridge: I want to go on record favoring all of these bills. I think they are all good bills and especially the act establishing a Southeastern Water Authority. I live in the Town of Ledyard, and we need that water through there. I spoke yesterday in favor of the Connecticut Water Company bill--practically the same thing-- and I think that the committee should either work together with both bills or at least get one of them out so that we can have the water. We have a chance for the Dow Chemical there to enlarge its plant, but they do need the water. We hope the committee will act favorably on it. Thank you.
- Rep. Martin: We have examined this bill in New London, and we are very whole-heartedly supporting it, and we offer our endorsement for it.
- Rep. Hill: I would like to go on record as supporting S.B. 402 and H.B. 3875 -- establishing a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority. I think it is long overdue. We tried very hard to have it last session, but we didn't succeed; so let's have it this session, please.
- Rep. Laudone: I note that we have five bills for this committee on hearings -- three dealing with

24.

WATER RESOURCES AND FLOOD CONTROL

MARCH 8, 1967

WEDNESDAY P.M.

the Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority. I would like at this time to go on record in favor of all three of those bills creating a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority and also would like to register in favor of the two bills pertaining to the watershed and flood control development -- that is S.B. 466 and H.B. 3647. I feel that the Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority bill has had considerable thought, has had study, and it is recommended by the Regional Planning Agency in this area. It is certainly a forward looking bill, and it is one that will coordinate the water supply system within the Southeastern Connecticut area, and it is well needed in a future looking program; and I trust this committee will act favorably on all those bills. Thank you.

Rep. Duda:

I speak in favor of S.B. 402 and like bills sponsored in the House by Rep. Cohen and Rep. Rose. I won't belabor the point. You've heard most of the representatives. The need, I'm sure, is obvious to you. The need is obvious by way of the Groton Public Utilities also proposing additional rights in the Town of Preston. The need is obvious because the Connecticut Water Company wants to solve the problem. It is my opinion that the problem has to be solved by a public water authority which has control over the entire area. Some of the details of the bill, I think, have probably been ironed out to the satisfaction of most of the representatives and most of the interested people in the area. I would urge the committee to report it favorably.

Rep. Cohen:

I'd like to go on record in favor of all five of these bills being heard this afternoon, and I was informed this morning by some people in Lebanon who said they wrote a letter. Did you receive it?

Chr. Stanley:

Yes, we did receive it.

(Contents of letter from Richard M. Cummings, First Selectman, Town of Lebanon:)

Our reading of S.B. ⁴⁶²~~204~~ (an act establishing

a Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority) raises several questions concerning the impact of this act on the Town of Lebanon.

Lebanon is not a member of the Southeastern Planning region and as such is not included in the provisions of this act. However, Lebanon borders the Southeastern Region and a substantial amount of the water flowing to the region originates in Lebanon.

At the present time, our Town Council is studying this act and should report to us in the very near future.

At this time, we ask the committee to give us the opportunity to present our attorney's findings within the next week for your consideration.

Rep. Rose:

I wish to go on record in favor of all the bills before your committee this afternoon. I have one here which is similar to two of the others, and three should be quite convincing. Thank you.

Chr. Stanley:

Are there any other legislators that would like to speak? Seeing no other legislators, we will listen to anyone now speaking in opposition of the bill.

Edward P. Williams, President

Connecticut Water Company: I would like to speak in opposition to the bill. If this bill is passed it will, in my opinion, protectively bar the entrance of any investor-owned utility into the southeastern region, which is a very large area of Connecticut, and the expansion of any existing water utility in that area. Provisions of Section 13 for seizure of watershed properties by the authority would make it extremely dangerous when investor-owned water companies enter the area. The condemnation provision in Section 14 would also make it practically impossible for an investor-owned water utility to help develop the area, and the implications of these provisions if applied to the entire State of Connecticut would bring to a halt the expansion of investor-owned water companies throughout the state.

MARCH 8, 1967

WEDNESDAY P.M.

Investor-owned water companies give the public maximum protection from rate regulations provided by the PUC, regulation of diverting water supplies by the Water Resources Commission, and regularity of purity by the Health Department.

Members of the investor-owned water companies now provide more water to citizens of Connecticut than do public water supplies. The Connecticut Water Company, which I represent, has submitted a bill asking for an extension of its franchise into Preston and Ledyard, and this bill is in direct conflict with ours. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the two bills have not been heard by the same committee. If this could possibly be arranged, I think it would be helpful. Also, I think your committee should give serious consideration to the provisions which discriminate against other utilities. If such provisions are necessary, I suggest that water plans for the entire state of Connecticut be undertaken at the state level before such bill is passed.

Now, If I may, I would like to speak to the two questions raised by Rep. Axelrod. First of all, the condemnation features: Any utility, whether it be public or private, I believe, must have condemnation features. However, they should not be condemnation provisions which would condemn one utility in favor of another. Our condemnation provisions in our charter will not do that and I don't think an authority such as this should have that provision.

Then, as to his question about regional approach. We are firm believers in regional approach, and we have put regional approach into practice. An example is the Rockville Water Supply which takes water from Lake Snipsit and is now pumping two million gallons a day into South Windsor and East Windsor and Windsor Locks. This was all done by investor-owned water companies. We got together with agreements approved by the Public Utilities Commission, and the Water

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

Resources Commission, and it seems to me that is the logical way to do it.

Chr. Stanley: Is the Connecticut Water Company, which does have an interest in Southeastern Connecticut...Do you feel, in your judgment, they are prepared to expand to the utmost the water potential in that area?

Mr. Williams: Absolutely. We need one thing. We need to have an assured rate of return -- a minimum of 6 per cent -- in order to pay our stockholders. Usually, if you figure out the amount of money that we need to take care of an investment of this sort, our rates would be no higher, sometimes quite a bit lower, than a public body if one takes into consideration the fact that between 15 cents and 20 cents of every dollar of revenue which we make goes back to the municipalities in the form of property taxes; not to mention the fact that we do pay federal income taxes.

Chr. Stanley: But, you do have on the drawing board, or you don't have on the drawing board, anything that would serve the 17 or 18 towns of that area?

Mr. Williams: We have on the drawing board right now a plan which would start to serve Preston and Ledyard and give the Dow Chemical Company the amount of water which we believe it would like to have, and the City of Groton the amount of water which it would need to have after 1972. This is a plan being prepared by Metcalf & Eddy. Other plans could be developed very quickly. We would probably, as someone pointed out, use the same consulting engineers which made the original study for this Southeastern Planning Agency, completely familiar with the area. Our approach might be a little bit different because we would probably supply areas in need first -- small areas -- and gradually tie them together instead of enter into a tremendous plan which might be difficult to finance from the beginning. But, I would like to point out that any plan that is financed which will go into several million dollars by an authority must have revenue to

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

pay the interest on the bonds and to retire the bonds, and sometime the amount of revenue needed to do that sort of thing is more than the amount of revenue we would need.

Chr. Stanley:

The bill that you said perhaps might more properly have come before this committee suggested south to an area in Preston. Is your company prepared in that particular case to develop that area to its maximum potential, or would you develop that area to the potential that would be required at the moment?

Mr. Williams:

We would develop it to the potential that would be required at the moment. But, it just so happens that the plan we have now would envision an immediate formation of a reservoir which would ultimately provide eight million gallons per day; not only to the residents of Preston and Ledyard as they needed it, but to the various small developments there in the event that we could serve those developments at less cost than they are now being served and also pipe into the Dow Chemical Company and to the City of Groton to give Groton the surplus water which it will need after 1972. I would like to ask some of the people who testified, such as those from Pfizer and Electric Boat, might also say they have no objection to our bill because we have had conversations with them.

Chr. Stanley:

It was developed in your testimony, I believe, that there was a bill in conflict, but that bill, I understand, affected three towns, and this affects seventeen or eighteen. I was just trying to establish what kind of conflict there was.

Mr. Williams:

The conflict is that an investor-owned water company could not possibly, in my opinion, enter Preston or Ledyard faced with the condemnation provisions in the authority bill as it now stands because the authority has the right to

WEDNESDAY P.M.

MARCH 8, 1967

take any water reservoir land, potential land, which it wants to, and suppose both bills were approved. We would have to submit to the authority our requirement for a given watershed, and the authority, naturally, if the watershed is any good, would say no. So, we would be barred from receiving additional water supply unless we have a free hand to attempt to acquire watershed properties. All we want is equal treatment, but we would like to be able to acquire watershed properties without having the provision in this bill that the authority could take them away from us.

- Chr. Stanley: But at the moment your plan only calls for three towns, isn't that a correct statement?
- Mr. Williams: That is correct. Well, and to pump water outside of those towns when needed.
- Rep. Chagnon: Aren't you supposed to be prepared for about 25 years in your program? You just said you were going to take care of things immediately. If the Public Utilities asked you to look a little further...
- Mr. Williams: We have plans, Sir -- till the year 2000 -- in all the areas we serve.
- Rep. Chagnon: You may have these plans in that.....?
- Mr. Williams: No, we don't because we have no franchise at the moment to serve Preston and Ledyard. We are asking for that franchise.
- Chr. Stanley: Is there anyone else who would speak in opposition? Seeing no one, I would declare the hearings closed on S.B. 402, H.B. 3875 and H.B. 2804. We will now open hearings on S.B. 466 and H.B. 3647.

S.B. 466

(Sen. Stanley) AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE BONDS FOR THE YANTIC RIVER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECT IN THE TOWNS OF NORWICH, FRANKLIN, LEBANON, COLCHESTER AND BOZRAH.