

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-29		100	4	3	3
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environment 90-91 Environment 81</i></li> <li>• <i>Environment 104</i></li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 526-528</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 994-996</li> </ul>

**H-110**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 3  
974-1450**

Wednesday, March 24, 1971

21.

MBS

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 3 of the Calendar. Calendar 141. House Bill No. 6138. An Act Concerning State Grants-In-Aid for Harbor Improvement Projects. File number 126.

FRANCIS J. MAHONEY, 19th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

FRANCIS J. MAHONEY, 19th District:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to transfer jurisdiction over state aid and for harbor improvement projects from the Community Affairs Department to the Connecticut Development Commission.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, those opposed? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 154. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 100. An Act Concerning the Funding and Powers of Lake Authorities. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A")

EDWARD L. IWANICKI, 79th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move for the acceptance of the committee's

Wednesday, March 24, 1971

22.

favorable report and passage of the bill.

MBS

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

EDWARD L. IWANICKI, 79th District:

Mr. Speaker, there's a Senate Amendment Schedule "A", will the Clerk please read the amendment.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A". In Section 1, line 13 delete "BODY" and insert in lieu thereof "BODIES" and delete "EACH" and insert in lieu thereof "ALL".

In Section 1, line 14, delete "TOWN" and insert in lieu thereof "TOWNS".

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A", will you remark?

EDWARD L. IWANICKI, 79th District:

Mr. Speaker, with this amendment it would allow member towns to be granted additional powers to their lake authorities. As an agent for member towns with respect to filing applications for grants or reimbursements with the state boating commission, the Water Resource Commission and other state agencies in connection with the state and federal programs. I urge passage of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, all those in favor of adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A"

Wednesday, March 24, 1971

23.

indicate by saying aye, those opposed. The amendment is adopted and it is ruled technical and we now have to proceed on the bill as amended. Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor indicate by saying aye, those opposed. The bill, as amended, is passed.

MBS

THE CLERK:

Calendar 157. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0942. An Act Concerning State Grants and Loans for School Building Projects. File 76.

DARIUS J. SPAIN, 166th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

DARIUS J. SPAIN, 166th District:

Mr. Speaker, this bill is to fund the state portion of the school building program which was enacted in 1969. The amount provided here is calculated to take care of any application, approved and or expected to be approved, by the end of June, 1971. I move its passage.

FRANCIS J. COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of this particular bill. Some three or four weeks ago we had another measure before us from the Appropriations Committee which allocated for the current biennium some \$9 million, which

**S-77**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**1971**

**VOL. 14**

**PART 2**

**474-956**

March 16, 1971

23.

If you are going to turn left it will be exactly the same, you would be in a horizontal position with your forefinger extended, and if you were going to turn right you would extend your arm upward in a raised position. I think that this will prevent any problems for out of state motorists who are in Connecticut. And I think that Connecticut is one of the few states which still has a system such as we have on our books at the present time. And I would urge adoption of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? The question is on the acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Those in favor signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed? The ayes have it the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Two items down on the Calendar No. 50, File No. 73. Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on the Environment S.B. 100 An Act Concerning The Funding and Powers of Lake Authorities.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, will the Clerk please read the Amendment?

March 16, 1971

24.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment A. is offered by Senator Ives. In Sec. 1, line 13; delete body and insert in lieu thereof bodies; and delete each and insert in lieu thereof all. In Section 1, line 14, delete town and insert in lieu thereof towns.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the Amendment?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, in drafting the original legislation the intent was that all member towns must agree to this formula adopted by them. And looking at the language in the bill, it looks like one town could adopt it and the other one might not. So the Amendment makes it very clear that all member towns must adopt and agree on a formula.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

I support the Amendment and it has been explained very well by the Minority Leader.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor of the Amendment indicate by saying aye. AYE. Opposed. The ayes have it the Amendment is adopted.

The Chair will rule that the Amendment is a technical Amendment and proceed with the bill as Amended.

March 16, 1971

25.

SENATOR PAC:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Sch. A. I believe.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR PAC:

This bill would apportion the expenses of Lake Authorities on a formula other than linear foot basis. And this is laid out according to their boundaries on the lakes. This formula would have to be accepted by all the towns and their legislative bodies. This is what the amendment was all about. It would also permit the lake authorities to act as an agent in any application to the state or any of its divisions. For any grants reimbursements and so forth. I think its a good bill. I move its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? The question is on the acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. AYE. Opposed? The ayes have it. The bill is passed as amended.

THE CLERK:

The next item, Calendar No. 51, File No. 75. Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations on Substitute Senate Bill 242. An Act Concerning An Appropriation To a Governor Leaving His Office.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT**

**PART 1  
1-338**

**1971  
Index**

WEDNESDAY 10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

exchange or the lease, and in discussing this with Mr. Matthews, they are willing to execute a lease, and so this would be satisfactory to both parties concerned, and the exchange will not be necessary. On S.B. 98, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DREDGING OF BANTAM LAKE, which was introduced by myself, I'd like to register a slight mild protest. These only appeared yesterday, and some of the people who wanted to be here today are going to be unable to come. Al Tyll is the chairman of the Bantam Lake Authority, and I've asked him to submit some statements, and I'll give them to the committee later, which will outline in detail what S.B. 98 and S.B. 99 do. Basically, S.B. 98 calls for the dredging of Bantam Lake. Bantam Lake is in the towns of Morris and Litchfield; it's the largest natural body of water in the State of Connecticut, and as a result of the 1955 flood, sediment has come into the lake to the extent of twenty-two feet in some areas, and it's gradually filling in this largest body and one of Connecticut's natural resources. We did not include a figure for the bonding, because we figured the bonding would go through a separate bonding bill, but it's approximately \$1,000,000 we're talking about. If the State would apply to the federal government for conservation, some percentage of this could be recovered by the State. S.B. 99, AN ACT CONCERNING BANTAM LAKE FLOOD CONTROL, asks that the State pick up the towns of Morris and Litchfield's share of the federal flood projects that are being investigated now by the Corps of Army Engineers. The figure on this one is \$200,000. And the last bill, S.B. 100, AN ACT CONCERNING LAKE AUTHORITIES, this adds two changes to the existing laws. In the first section, in the original bill, it says that the towns shall pay their respective expenses on, based on, pro-rated on the shore line. This has caused some problems in the new towns that would like to establish lake authorities, so we added the words "or any other formula agreed on and adopted by all member towns' legislative bodies." And then the last change is in Section 3 on the back of the bill. If the towns' legislative bodies wanted the lake authorities, they could grant authority to them to act for the towns in applying for the refund for the boating commission, and grants under the water resources. As it stands now, using Bantam as an example, they hired a patrolman to put out the buoys and markers, and so forth, but the individual selectmen of Litchfield and Morris have to make the applications to the State Boating Commission, and it comes back separately. And the towns want the authority for them to act as agents.

Sen. Pac: Thank you very much, Senator. I'd just like to comment on the fact that we didn't have sufficient notice. Actually, this has been printed well over a week, and through some malfunction of our computers again - you know.

Sen. Ives: Well, some people will be here. Mr. Tyll can't make it, he's an employee of the Superior Court in Litchfield, and he couldn't on one days' notice, change, so he's the one who can give you most of the information.

Sen. Pac: We'd be happy to talk to him, and pick up - well, if you have any presentations, written presentations, we'll get it into the file.

WEDNESDAY 10:00 A.M. THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

- Rep. Pugliese: The only way I can answer that question is the fact that you have these people registered in this work force. Any of them that seem to become permanently in the force, you can look to their, not necessarily education, but work skills, and try to find them work within the community or outside of the community. They certainly aren't going to enjoy working at the minimum wage and trying to call this a living, and I think it should be an adjunct to everything else, rather than trying to set up a work force that people will stay in. That's the point of the bill.
- Rep. Matthews: Is there any limit as to how long they may stay in this pool? Then they would have to leave it, thereby not giving them the power Senator Cashman indicates they would have.
- Rep. Pugliese: Well, I think that's certainly worth considering. I didn't consider that, but it is worth considering.
- Sen. Pac: Any other questions? Thank you very much, Representative. Any other legislators?
- Rep. Harlow: Rep. Harlow from Litchfield. I'd like to make just a general statement regarding three bills, S.B. 98, S.B. 99, and S.B. 100, submitted by Sen. Ives, Senate Minority Leader. These three bills deal in general with Bantam Lake, the largest natural fresh-water lake in Connecticut, and this lake currently has severe pollution, environmental problems. There's a definite need, I think, for the committee and the state to consider some form of assistance for this body of water. Sen. Ives will be here shortly to speak on behalf of these bills in more detail. In addition to that, the Chairman of the Bantam Lake Authority, Mr. Al Tyll, is unable to be here today, but he will send someone over here with a detailed statement as to the facts and figures which are going to be incorporated into each of these individual pieces of legislation. Thank you.
- Sen. Pac: Thank you. Senator Ives has already spoken, so we have it in the record.
- Rep. LaGrotta: I'm Guy LaGrotta from the 170th. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'd like to speak in favor of S.B. 98, 99, and 100, which touches the town of Morris, which is in my district. On S.B. 100 the lake authority development actually started working around Bantam Lake, which is the largest natural body of water. We created a bill in '67, we did improve it in '69, and the part we'd like changed is, as we go, we find little inequities, and in this one, the change would be that, like when they treat the lake with copper sulphate, the present bill is that they shall divide the cost according to shoreline. Well, we find that that is not always relative, because now, Lillenoma is forming a lake authority, and they may have a very small piece of shoreline, but they may turn in 30 or 40,000 people out of the town of Danbury. By comparison, this doesn't always seem equitable. So we would like to add,

12.  
SPM

WEDNESDAY 10:00 A.M. THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

in addition to, that if the towns agree to some formula between themselves, that it be legal that they be allowed to do it. Because just shoreline isn't always the most valid way to divide the costs. On the other two bills, they look a little bit cloudier after yesterday, but both of these are money bills. Bantam Lake, which has been one of the lakes in the state where Dr. Benoit has done a lot of research on algae, which is a problem for all of us, one of the problems there is that it's very shallow, and there are some portions of it which would be very greatly improved if it were dredged. The federal government is ready to help us with this, and I'd ask for your most serious consideration, if the money is available.

Sen. Pac: I'm sure if the bills are worthwhile, you'll help us amend the Governor's budget.

Rep. LaGrotta: Is that a question?!

Rep. Matthews: Is this a matter that local towns have to vote on? Have an agreement on? Has this been done?

Rep. LaGrotta: Well, I'll tell you how it started quickly. It started in Morris in Bantam Lake, because the Litchfield selectmen and the Morris selectmen were to get together and do something about the lake, and it would come up in the summer when they were all busy, and it just fell between the shares. So we devised this formula that, by vote of the legislature and by vote of the towns, that they wanted a formal lake authority, they would each appoint three members who would have an ongoing program all through the winter, and it's worked very effectively. So all we're doing now is just changing the powers a little.

Sen. Pac: Is that all? Thank you very much. Any other legislators? Now we come to the public portion of the hearing, and anyone wishing to be heard, come down here, sign in, and come right up forward.

Mr. Bampton: Gentlemen; my name is Ted Bampton, I'm the Director of the Board of Fisheries and Game, I'd like to speak briefly in support of H.B. 6092. I am well aware of the fiscal problems of this state, but I do believe that there is a pressing need for access to our marine waters, particularly for trailer-mounted boats. At the present time, there are only thirteen such access areas along the coast. Only one of these is in Fairfield County. One of the biggest problems which faces us is the lack of sites which are suitable, and we've found that such sites are virtually impossible to acquire on a willing-sales basis from private owners. We have been successfully negotiating for the use of city-owned lands. The precedent has been set in New Haven, in Bridgeport, most recently in Hartford, where we have taken an easement from the city and utilized state funds to construct a public boat launching ramp. The one in Stamford was designed - well actually, we've been discussing this with city officials for perhaps the last six years - the design was incorporated into their long-range planning development for West Beach, which is a city-owned

WEDNESDAY 10:00 A.M. THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Mr. Corrigan: I'm Raymond Corrigan, I'm here as a representative of the Department of Corrections to speak on S.B. 616, AN ACT CONCERNING PURCHASE, SALE OR EXCHANGE OF LAND WHEN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IS NOT IN SESSION. When the Department of Corrections was formed, there were three basic institutions that had trustees running these organizations at that time, and the sale, acquisition or exchange of property was handled through this particular group. Now since the Department of Correction has been formed, we now have a Council of Correction which performs the same function, and what we're basically trying to do is to establish a system within the Department of Correction for this purpose, that is in conformance with the remaining procedures in the rest of the state agencies.

Mr. Driscoll: I am David Driscoll, a member of the Bantam Lake Authority, and I am representing the chairman of the Bantam Lake Authority, Mr. Al Tyll, and I would like to read you three memorandums prepared by Mr. Tyll, concerning S.B. 98, S.B. 99, S.B. 100. First of all, Mr. Tyll expresses his regrets at not being able to attend the hearing this morning. I have for the chairman, sir, a copy of each memorandum of each three bills, and I'd like to read them now. The memorandum concerning S.B. 98 - "Bantam Lake is rapidly filling in or dying by sedimentation. With each flood it becomes shallower. After each summer season it shallows because the lake is rich in nutrients spurring heavy weeds and algae growth. When these water plants die, they sink to the bottom and decompose, thus becoming more mud and shallowing the lake. At least 100 acres, or one-ninth of Bantam Lake needs dredging, especially the area of South Bay which is the furthest from any outlet or inlet. This bay, therefore, is the shallowest, has the greatest rate of sedimentation, and will (if man does not intervene) become the first portion of the lake to die off and turn to swamp. The Bay is roughly 200 acres. About 20% of this bay is already too shallow for boating. Approximately 50% of the bay (or 100 acres) should be dredged six feet deeper, or a total of approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of mud and sediment is to be taken out. Dredging is absolutely necessary and will benefit the lake in the following ways: 1) Will begin to reverse the dying process, namely sedimentation containing rich nutrients (weeds and algae depend on these nutrients); 2) Dredging will deepen the lake, thus keeping the water cooler (algae and weeds like warm temperatures); 3) Sunlight cannot penetrate deeper water (algae and weeds need sunlight); 4) It will again open many acres of the lake up for safe boating; 5) Since this will no doubt lessen weed and algae growths, we may save money for weed and algae treatments in the future. Dr. Richard Benoit, consultant to the Water Resources Commission, states that if the lake can be deepened to 10 or 12 feet, weeds will most probably not grow. The Bantam Lake Authority hereby urges passage of this bill." The memorandum concerning S.B. 99 - "On September 3, 1969, the Bantam Lake Authority applied to the Corps of Army Engineers for flood control for Bantam Lake. On December 15, 1969, after an extensive survey of all property owners affected by Bantam Lake, flood damage figures were sent to the Army Engineers as follows: