

<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 71-307		684	4	2	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Government, Administration, &amp; Policy</i> 109</li> <li>• <i>Government, Administration, &amp; Policy</i> 113</li> <li>• <i>Finance</i> 184-186</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2780-2781</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1585</li> </ul>

**H-113**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 6  
2503-3010**

Friday, May 14, 1971

40

REPRESENTATIVE GILLIES:

I was not aware of such an amendment and I would ask therefore that the matter be passed retaining -

MR. SPEAKER:

Just to be passed temporarily.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLIES:

Passed temporarily, if we may.

CLERK:

Calendar 844, Senate Bill 0684 - An Act Concerning Arbitration of Town Grievance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Willard.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD:

I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in accordance with concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD:

This bill is the section of the statutes that provides for towns who are grieved by reclassifications of highways which sets up a manner or statement of arbitration. This merely states that the town will advise the commissioner within 60 days of their intention to bring this matter to arbitration and further that they will appoint their arbitrator within 30 days after written notice from the commissioner. Failure to do either of these items makes

ad

Friday, May 14, 1971

41

the acts of the commissioner final.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar 856, Substitute for House Bill 8766 - An Act Concerning the Return of Certain Lands to the Town of East Haven, File 914.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Gagliardi of the 103rd-

REPRESENTATIVE GAGLIARDI:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE GAGLIARDI:

This bill will at long last permit the state military, public works department and the legislative of the town of East Haven to sit at the bargaining table and discuss the return of certain lands that are presently not being used on a fair basis to the town of East Haven. This is a matter which the Town of East Haven has long sought. There is no objection to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

ad

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1457-1920**

May 6, 1971

Page 46

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill. This bill would allow the Commanding Officer of the Military forces to impose a fine or pay forfeiture of not more than \$25.00 for one offense. It's a good bill and should pass.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 494. File No. 652. Favorable report of the joint committee on Government Administration and Policy. Senate Bill 684. An Act Concerning Arbitration of Town Grievance.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This will give the town wherein there is work being done the opportunity of filing and after the filing, if it wasn't satisfactory to appoint arbitrators to settle the dispute.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 497. File No. 650. Favorable report of the joint committee on Finance. Senate Bill 1569. An Act Concerning Meritorious Service Award for State Employees.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT  
ADMINISTRATION  
&  
POLICY**

**PART 1  
1-333**

**1971  
Index**

## GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

- Mrs. June Goodman: requested in the bill would enable many, many, communities to benefit from professional performances. Not all as large as symphony orchestras - even a trio at \$250. might need some pump priming. This bill encourages local initiative and with the section in it about 30% of the excess proceeds going to the commission, it might even make some money for the state. Thank you.
- Sen. Sullivan: I see on the list that we have Mr. John Bentley from the Conn. Dept. of Transportation in regard to 684 - is he still here? I'd just as soon let you get back to your job - you can speak if you want on that bill. This is the Governor's new austerity program.
- John Bentley: John Bentley, State Dept. of Transportation, speaking on Bill 684. The Dept. of Transportation strongly supports S.B. 684; section 3a-17 of the statutes provides the members by which a town agreed by a decision of the commissioner regarding jurisdiction over a road, may take the matter to arbitration. However, by the simple device of not affording an arbitrator, the town may scoff an action of the commissioner indefinitely. As a result some recommendations under the 1961 re-classification act have never been implemented. In other instances, criteria have been carefully documented to substantiate a recommendation of the Commissioner but it has not been possible to present the matter up to a board of arbitrators for a decision. Legal action on this bill and subsequent enactment by the General Assembly would in no way limit the right of the towns to invoke arbitration procedures. Final decision would continue to be made by the arbitrators on any appeal regarding roadway re-classification.
- Sen. Sullivan: Thank you. Again I want to point out - if you have a prepared statement it will probably get more attention if you'll turn the prepared statement in to us and just make a brief summary of what it is. The next person is Domenic - Mrs. Domenic Lorari - your name again -
- Mrs. Dominick Lorenzo: Mrs. Dominick Lorenzo, I represent the Conn. Opera Guild - an affiliate of the Conn. Opera Association. We are here primarily to bring - we would like to have you help us with our program particularly because we bring music into the life of the youngsters of our whole community and opera we hope will be here to stay for many, many years and the Opera Guild stresses this very important part of their program because they feel that bringing music into the lives of the young will keep opera here for many years to come if they appreciate it and love opera such as I did as a young girl - well I think most of the youngsters in our community will get release from frustration in their lives today, and we hope that you will support this bill because it's a very important one and every little bit that we can get will help us to continue with our program. Thank you.

## GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 10, 1971

- Ray Caserino: this bill represents is an ideal accommodation of public service and professional need. It is right for the program of a State Arts Commission and it is right for the Conn. Legislature in 1971. Thank you.
- Sen. Sullivan: I declare the hearing closed in regard to H.B. 6493 and would you kindly leave your statements with the secretary here. All right, we'll move on to S.B. 269, a Grant in Lieu of Taxes to the Town of Oxford. Anybody here to speak in regard to that one? Pro or con. If not, I'll declare the hearing closed in regard to S.B. 269 and move on to S.B. 524, An Act Concerning the Review of Municipal Contracts and Board of Education Contracts which we are referring to the Committee on Labor which will have a public hearing on that on Friday and at the same time S.B. 956 which is also being referred to the Committee on Labor for a hearing to be announced. Move to S.B. 669, An Act Concerning State Grants to City, Town and Borough Departments of Health for the Appointment of Local and Regional Health Offices. Anybody here to speak on that? I'll declare the hearing closed in regard to that bill. S.B. 684 An Act Concerning Arbitration of Town Grievances. Anybody here to speak on that? I declare the hearing closed in regard to S.B. 684. S.B. 785 An Act Concerning Local Dog Wardens. Anybody here in regard to that? I declare the hearing closed in regard to that one. S.B. 786 An Act Concerning the Appointments of Local Dog Wardens. If nobody's here to speak in favor of that I declare the hearing closed in regards to it. S.B. 810 an Act to Exclude Certain Supervisory and Administrative Personnel from Training Requirements.
- Philip R. Lincoln: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Philip R. Lincoln, I'm Chief of Police in the Town of Newington and Legislative Chairman for the Conn. Association of Chiefs of Police. This particular bill is intended to clarify a situation which has developed. The clear intent of this law at the time that it was initially passed would require mandatory training under the direction of the Municipal Police Training Council for basic training for recruits. Since that time, and perhaps more increasingly in the year past and perhaps in the future, Chiefs of Police and certain police administrators have been chosen from out of state or from Federal Agencies or from the rolls of retired service personnel who bring certain specialized skills and training to the position for which they are chosen, and the question will arise and has arisen as to whether or not that these individuals even with their education, with their past experience in law enforcement and with their great amount of training that they are bringing to

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**FINANCE**

**PART 1  
1-329**

**1971  
Index**

J. Baldwin: No, sir, I would not be opposed to that as there were't too many great agents involved, because it is, it would fall upon the tax collector to decide when a person came into pay his taxes where he fell. If there were too many variations, this would create a problem, although that, it would be more, it would be outweighed by the benefits and fruits from that type of system, then the present system. There is a great deal of loss in the present system and that compromise, also, would nollify that law.

Rep. Violette: Any other questions from the Committee. Hear none thank you sir. Our next speaker this morning is Adrian Forcetier.

Adrian Forcetier: Chairman, members of the Committee, I want to speak in favor of the bill to transfer the road fund to the transportation fund. I believe this is 684. which is being printed and transferred to the Transportation Committee.

Rep. Violette: Would you give me your name and your organization.

A.Forcetier: My name is Adrian Forcetier, I'm connected with the University of Hartford. I'm engaged on a transportation study for greater metropolitan Hartford in Connecticut of alternative methods of transportations to building more highways. We have been advised by the Highway Department that highways in metropolitan areas, urban areas are extremely costly running from \$20. million to \$40. million a mile for an eight lane highway and occupying 41 acres for each mile of highway of taxable land. We are, therefore, engaged in a mass transit study which shows that it is possible to have alternate systems such as a high speed tube system for transporting people in this area. Our studies show that area within a 20 miles area from the center of the city of Hartford, according to the 1970 census, has one million and 65 people. According to the booking institute in Washington, a million people, in a metrololitan zone is justification for a high speed rail underground rapid transit system. We are therefore in favor of the diversion of highway funds to the transportation fund, in order to allow the people of the State and Government of Connecticut time to thoroughly investigate this matter. I say this because in our initial contact, with the officials of the Capital Area Planning Agency, with the City of Hartford in person of their Director of Developments, little was known of all kind of system and their costs. Since that time, in an extensive study has been made, costs figures have been worked out for the Department of Urban, Rapid transit

A. Forcetier: in Washington, by people like the Houser Company on the cost of tunneling, and as a result of these extensive studies, in the last few years, as a result of the extensive allotment of tunnel boring machines, which have greatly reduced the costs and have not followed the cost of construction labor, the cost of tunneling has been so reduced that it is now practical to consider underground tunneling system and transit system. And the population figures, without taking into account the connection with the, with Springfield and through Bradley air field, are sufficient in this area to justify consideration. We, therefore, wish to support the bills to transfer the funds into a transportation fund, rather than being reserved for the highways, until such time as this matter can be given consideration. We would like to say that, we support this in view of the fact that the highway system, according to the Connecticut Development Association in Connecticut is superior to any other State in the Union and this publication is several years old. They state that Connecticut has the greatest roads, had a greater share of roads, paved hard surface - 97% than in any other State of the Union, so that it is obvious from statements like this and their spending 24% more on maintenance of these, some people might doubt that, but it is obvious that since those years, this was 1962, considerable additional sums have been spent on expressways. We feel very concerned, I think anybody that is in Hartford during the afternoon of December 23rd, last year, when Hartford was locked in a inaudible of cars, as I personally experienced, and it was impossible to drive out Capital Avenue to West Hartford, to Farmington, Albany Avenue to get out of 91 or Washington Street because they were all in entirely blocked with cars, and had there been a fire in Hartford, at this time, or any other disaster, it would have been a real disaster, because no firemen, police car or any other ambulance could have moved. The roads were entirely chocked, were not relieved until nearly nine o'clock at night, and this extended, by my own experience, right out into the inner suburbs this conjection of cars, which were practically immovable. It is therefore obvious to anybody who takes a inaudible view of the situation that some form of mass transportation or transit has to be considered and we realize that under the Federal financing of highways with 1910, that it is obvious that the desire to bring highways into the city, because the high Federal share of money has unbalanced a serious consideration of the needs of the city, particularly Greater Metropolitan City, for mass transit, and forced highways to lead into the city to the

A. Forcetier: point where the city streets cannot, because of there geometrical limitations, actual physical size limitations, cannot be expanded, unless you want to level all the buildings, which of course becomes ridiculous. We, therefore, feel that we should support and recommend support, as a result of our studies which will be published, given in the transportation symposium in May in a formal paper, and I might say that we have the Connecticut Highway Department working with us both the research group and the general group, we have the Director of the City of Hartford working with us, the mayor of West Hartford and the Director of East Hartford which are so concerned with these problems that they feel the solutions that we are arriving at on an economical and population basis have much more hope of hope of solving the problems on a permanent basis than any other system. Thank you.

Rep. Violette: Thank you very much for your very informative information Mr. Forcetier. Any questions from the Committee. Hear none, thank you sir. Our next speaker is Willibald Hoffmann, I believe. Oh, pardon me, I believe one of our members of the General Assembly here.

Thank you, members of the Committee, I appreciate you're letting me speak, as you know, we are all running around from one committee to another, and I think

Rep. Violette: Give your name, Representative.

Rep. Rose: from the 69th. I would like to speak in favor of HB5221 and also SB139 which have to do with the bookkeeping process of communities getting back the rebate for state tax on gasoline used by municipal vehicles. As you perhaps know the present arrangement involves considerable paper work on the part of the local community. They pay the full amount of the gasoline, get receipts for the gasoline they bought from the station, turn these tickets in to the State and make a report of the deduction required; the State will have to go through considerable other paper work to refund the communities the State tax, which is what we are all concerned about. The Federal Government, of course, does not go through this process, and allows the municipalities to pay the gasoline at the price minus the tax, at the time of purchase, this is what we are requesting in both of these bills. I think it is a very reasonable one, it will save money and save a great deal of time. Thank you.