

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-415		5218	11	6	3
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 232-233 • <i>Environment</i> 244 • <i>Environment</i> 262 • <i>Environment</i> 327 • <i>Finance</i> 86 • <i>Finance</i> 811-815 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3134-3139 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2421-2423

H-114

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 7
3011-3376**

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

42

ad

The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Returning to Calendar 926, House Bill 5218 - An Act Including Wetlands in Open Space Land Classification. File 973.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Ciampi.

REPRESENTATIVE CIAMPI:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE CIAMPI:

I rise in support of House Bill 5218. Far too often in the past our wetlands have been neglected and as a consequence our wetlands have been disappearing as rapidly as we have preserved other facts of natural environment. As our marshes have disappeared so have the birds, reptiles which live in and around the marshes. This bill is essential to our efforts to preserve the wetlands. We will accept at least 3 significant changes. One, we will be provided tax credit for preservation of wetlands just as we are presently providing for the preservation of other open spaces. Second, we will be availing state and federal grants for the preservation of our wetlands and third, we will be imposing the same restrictions on the use of wetlands which are presently enforced regarding use of other open spaces. This is a good bill and a very important bill. I urge the member to support it.

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

43

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill. Gentleman from the 121st.

REPRESENTATIVE PLATT:

I urge the acceptance and passage of this bill. In 1969 when we passed Public Act 490, setting up the wetlands bill to protect our wetlands, we neglected to recognize the fact that the people who own these wetlands would have no incentive to keep them if they were to be taxed under the regular process. I urge the passage of this bill to protect these lands and to influence people to keep them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Ajello.

REPRESENTATIVE AJELLO:

I would just like to say that I am happy to stand and support it and to point out that it is part of a specific statement in the Democratic party's platform to further protect and preserve our wetlands.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Lavine.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVINE:

I think the important highlights of this proposal have been made. I believe that perhaps in the environment area there is nothing more important than our wetlands and preservation. Over the past years we have lost practically half of our wetlands. This is a splendid bill and I urge everyone to support it.

MR. SPEAKER:

ad

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

44

Representative Clark.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK:

I want to support this bill. This will do a great deal to please the owners of the wetlands. Many persons who bought waterfront property with the hope of developing into a marina or using it for other purposes find now that they are only going to be able to use it to have open spaces and I feel that this is a very just way to have them taxed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Camp.

REPRESENTATIVE CAMP:

I endorse the spirit of this bill. It would be my understanding that the intent of this bill is that any land which is a marsh and remains as a marsh could be enjoyed the privileges of being a wetland. However, I believe that under the section, an area could be mapped and designated as a wetland and yet at the same time might have since the designation had a parking lot built on it. If this is the case, are we possibly giving the benefit to someone who doesn't deserve it and should not the bill perhaps be amended to indicate an area designated as wetland and in fact preserved as wetland should receive these benefits. If Mr. Ciampi would advise, I would appreciate it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond. Representative Lavine.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVINE:

If I understand the question correctly, I think the answer

ad

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

45

would be you would have to make an application for open space classification and at that particular time there is an inspection of the land for open space.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. Representative Camp.

REPRESENTATIVE CAMP:

I ask that the matter be passed temporarily. I have no intention of opposing it, I would just like to straighten myself out on something that I don't think is clear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. Further remarks on the bill. Representative Camp.

REPRESENTATIVE CAMP:

Mr. Collins has suggested that he is not sure of the point himself and for that reason I will vote in the affirmative and if my point is well taken I will raise it by reconsideration tomorrow but not otherwise hold up the business of the House. I do support the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 931, Substitute for House Bill 6483 - An Act Concerning Prescribing of Drugs by Brand and Generic Names.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Prete.

ad

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

46

ad

REPRESENTATIVE PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, we are still awaiting an amendment which is being prepared on this bill. May this be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

So ordered.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar 940, Substitute for House Bill 9226 - An Act Authorizing Edward G. Mascolo to Sue the State.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Healey.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE HEALEY:

Edward G. Mascolo was retained by the state of Connecticut as a special public defender in the first degree murder case in Waterbury. He devoted a great amount of time and effort in the defense of this matter. When he was through he was told to submit a bill which he did, at the prevailing minimum rate in the Waterbury area for a matter of this sort of \$250 a day. He has been unable to come to an agreement with the Judicial Department as to the amount of the bill. The Judicial Department has suggested \$75.00 a day which would appear to be a

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

47=

ad

ridiculous compensation for the great wear and tear of one's body which is involved in defending a first degree murder case. They have been unable to resolve their differences and he cannot sue the state without authority from this body. This bill would simply permit him to have it heard in a court of law and determine what the reasonable value of services rendered in fact is, and that is what he is entitled to under the statute controlling public defenders.

IT is a good bill and it ought to pass.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill.

If not, all those in favor indicate by saying Aye.

Opposed. The bill is passed.

S-80
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL.14
PART 5
1921-2435

May 25, 1971

Page 18.

attraction to draw industry from the North to the South, one of them at least was the lower cost of financing. This bill will work on the principal that the tax exempt feature of State bonds which will give the directly passed on to the manufacturers. It is an excellent step forward into a base and then hopefully eliminates some of the unemployment that exists in this state and certainly to make Connecticut a more attractive climate for industry that we might normally draw from our favorite position in the Northeast corridor.

THE CHAIR:

Question on passage. Will you remark further.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, I'd like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from the 17th and to congratulate him for his part in the authorship of this bill. I think it is an important step and I would hope that it would obtain our unanimous support.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage, will you remark further. If not, all those in favor of passage, signify by saying Aye. The Ayes have it, the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 12, Calendar #863, file #973. Favorable report Joint Senate Committee on Finance. An Act Including Wetlands in Open Space Land Classification. H.B. 5218.

May 25, 1971

Page 19.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage, will you remark further. If not, all those in favor, signify by saying Aye. The Ayes have it, the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 12, Calendar #863, file #973. Favorable report Joint Senate Committee on Finance. H.B. 5218. An Act Including Wetlands in Open Space Land Classification.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, the bill allows the same exclusion or favorite treatment in the laws concerning local taxation for wetland as is now afforded to other open space land development.

THE CHAIR:

My friends in the rear of the room, please move into the caucus room. You have no idea how the voices carry up here. Thank you Senator Buckley.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I would like to add my support to this bill. I think it is a, it is one way we can encourage

May 25, 1971

Page 20.

the attention of many of the wetlands of the state, the small pieces and that, that could be in the deliniation of wetlands by the Agricultural Department by giving these people a reduced taxation. In doing this, it will encourage them to retain the land, rather than selling it and putting it on the market and then having the risk of desolation.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further, if not, all those in favor of passage, signify by saying Aye. The Ayes have it, the bill is passed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, before the clerk reads them. On page 13, two last minute switches. May we pass retaining Calendar #867 and Calendar #872.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk, was I going to appoint a Committee of conference and a inaudible which you were going to bring to my attention.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

The Chair, concerning H.B. 5375, file #324, appoint as the Senate members, under rule 22 of the Joint Rules, on a Committee of Conference, Senators Dupont, Buckley and Power.

THE CLERK:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 1
1-338**

**1971
Index**

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Sen. Pac Presiding

Members Present: Senators: Eddy, Gunther
Representatives: Ciampi, Ryan, Erab, Hogan,
Platt, Iwanicki, McNellis, Lavine, Matthews,
Tiffany, Miller, Stroffolino, Fox, Locke,
Rogers, Della Vecchia

Sen. Pac, We will now start this meeting and we'll try to put a time limit of five minutes on each individual. The legislators will speak first.

Sen. Eddy, 9th District. I'm speaking in behalf of the Meskill Administration. I would like to testify in favor of S.B. 398, S.B. 405, S.B. 404, S.B. 636, S.B. 639, S.B. 661. S.B. 404 and S.B. 661 will tighten the regulation which will govern the highway commissioner relative to the construction and improvement of highways which pass through parks, historic sites, and public water supplies to make the building of a highway which pass through a park or public water supplies subject to the review by the Council of Environmental Quality. We feel that this is a necessary step in the continuing struggle of protection in our environment. S.B. 405, which we also favor would encourage private land owners to make their land available to the public for such recreational activities as hunting, fishing, swimming, boating, camping, picnicing, hiking, etc. By limiting the threat of law-suits which result in injury while a member of the public is using the land. Such a step is long overdue and we hope you will consider it favorably. S.B. 636, is similar to S.B. 405. S.B. 639, AN ACT CONCERNING TIDAL WETLANDS would further protect our wetlands by allowing the commissioner to designate an area as a wetland even a map of the area is completed to protect it from the immediate danger of filling, dredging, or any other activity. It specifies however, that the map must be completed within 60 days. This is another of the recommendations of the Governor Environmental Committee, and we favor it. Thank you Mr. Dhairman. Now speaking for myself, I would just like to say very briefly that I favor S.B. 298, which is the establishment of a scenic and protective river system for Connecticut. There will be many members of the public here to testify on this bill, and I would prefer to have them be the experts on this subject. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Sen. Pac, Thank you very much Sen. Eddy. Any other legislatures?

Rep. Clarence Platt, 121st District, and I want to speak briefly on H.B. 5218 which proposes to include the approved wetlands on the 490 which is the open space bill to reduce the tax base on this land to encourage people to hold their land. Under the wetland bill, as you probably know, the state is obligated to buy this land if the owner insists upon doing something with it. I've attended several of the hearings on this land and the point has been brought out that the property owners just can't afford to keep it under the assessments that are being placed on this land, they can't use it and the rule is not much in favor for them to keep it except private ownership. In my city some of the wetland is assessed at \$3,000 and \$4,000 an acre, and these people can not afford to keep it. Under this wetland act the assessor in my city tells me that this will probably go down to about \$25 an acre, which would encourage the people to keep it.

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

I think this is an important part of the wetland act to encourage the people to keep the land in private ownership rather than force the state to buy it. Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac, Any other legislators?

Sen. Gunther, the 21st Senatorial District. I'm speaking of S.B. 368. This bill is probably one of the most important conservation bills of this session. In 1969 we finally succeeded in getting the wetland bill, public act 695 passed to protect Connecticut's wetlands. In the past one and a half year the state has been going through the mapping stages of the law, and we are now beginning to get petitions for the use of the wetlands by their wetlands. If under this law we deny the use of the man's property by virtue of the law we will be required to reimburse him for his interest. Right now there are limited funds if any funds to cover this portion of the law. If state does not provide for the ultimate purchase in the wetland it could destroy years of work to get this protection and conceivably could be the death now for the wetlands bill. It is my understanding that in the state of Maine their law which also requires the ultimate payment from the land that the owner has been denied the use of. That court has ruled that the state cannot buy the land when the owner has the right to use it, otherwise the law was unconstitutional. Our wetlands bill will be in jeopardy if we do not pass S.B. 368. At this moment the Commissioner of Agriculture is due to decide on the disposition of the Great Meadows in Stratford, regardless of his decision this case will be challenged in court. If Connecticut does not provide for the ultimate purchase of these wetlands we will lose the marsh and our law. I would like to say I'm also in favor of Rep. Platt's bill on including it under the open spaces, the 490.

Rep. Lavine, I agree with you totally, but the question is will the Governor allow the 5 million in bond if the legislature passes it ?

Sen. Gunther, All I can say is, I Don't know what the Governor is going to do but, this is one of those emergency situations that I don't think we can ignore. I know today won't have a handful of people that will be up here speaking on this bill, and yet if you remember two years ago we had the entire state up here, screaming and yelling we needed this protection. Now, without the money I can almost predict that our wetlands bill will be destroyed by virtue of a default that the people will be able to use wetlands, and if we don't have the money to buy the interest we're out of business. So I don't know if it's a case of choice or if you have a choice. I think we have to do something about this.

Earl Holdsworth, 125th District. I would like to speak in favor of H.B. 5811. AN ACT CONCERNING INSTANTANEOUS MINIMUM FLOW OF RIVERS AND STREAMS This bill has the support of practically all the fish and game societies, angler societies, etc. The statement of progress is very indicative of exactly what this bill covers, the bill is to insure adequate river and stream flow which is consistent with requirements of public health, public safety, public utilities, public water supplies and industry, and that it will sustain a chronic life in stock rivers and streams of this state. Our ecology at present time is a very important issue, this is part of this whole program which will support and

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Sen. Pac: Thank you.

Edward J. Daly: I am chief of the Wetlands Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. I'm here this morning to read into the record of the statement of Joseph N. Gill, Commissioner of Agriculture and Natural Resources. This is a general statement with respect to Connecticut Tidal Wetlands, and the many proposals which have been made to amend this act, and which I bring before you for your consideration. I would like to begin if I may with a brief summary of the status of the program for your information. Biological delineation in inventory of Connecticut's Tidal Wetlands is 81% complete as of this date. Engineering work required by the statutes for preparation of hearing maps and final wetland boundary maps is just over 50% complete. The majority of the major public hearings in the proposed bounds for the wetlands will take place in April, May, and June of 1971. We are confident that all of Connecticut Tidal Wetlands will be under regulation by mid-summer of this year. We firmly support bill numbers, H.B. 5218 and H.B. 5669, which would add wetlands to the open space classification of public act 490. This is a highly desirable change, and it should be adopted. We are also in favor of S.B. 368, which would provide funds for the acquisition of tidal wetlands. Purchase of these marshlands is still the best and most secure form of protection. H.B. 6245 concerning alteration of a wetland would eliminate unnecessary duplication of public hearings and other procedures when certain marsh areas no longer meet the statutory definition of a wetland. The purpose of this bill is to correct a deficiency in the present law and we are in favor of this change. In order to carry out the purposes of the law it is necessary that the Commission of Agriculture of Natural Resources or his representative have the clear and unequivocal right to enter privately owned wetlands to survey these areas, and for other reasons. H.B. 6251 would provide this authority to the Commissioner. We urge your favorable consideration of this amendment. A number of proposals which would establish a moratorium on development of wetland, these include S.B. 398, H.B. 5220, H.B. 5807, H.B. 6090, and H.B. 6472. We are certainly not opposed to a carefully drawn moratorium clause in the law, despite the fact that virtually all the tidal wetlands will be under regulation before moratorium could be established. We would favor it if it could be beneficial to use in any reasonable measure in our efforts to preserve the remaining marshes in our state. H.B. 6708, AN ACT CONCERNING COMPENSATION FOR TAKING OF LAND UNDER THE WETLANDS ACT would repeal the compensatory section of the wetland preservation statutes. Adoption of such a proposal would present a very strong probability

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

TO that organization, we are members of the Farmington River Watershed Association, the Connecticut Forest and Park Association, the Connecticut River Watershed Association. All these organizations are in one way or another concerned with the wide use of streams. With regard to this bill, our desire to see our streams preserved in a natural free-running state, stems not only from our aesthetic sense or our love of nature undisturbed, but also from the fear that many future usages of free-running streams are as yet unanticipated. For instance, to use our experience as an example, we have white-water canoed in Connecticut in every month of the year, but would have to admit that there are presently probably not more than 200 canoes running rapids in Connecticut on any one day. However, white-water canoeing in the U. S. is in its infancy--comparable to skiing at the end of WW 11 when there were no chair lifts. White-water canoeing could very easily boom into the same thing that skiing has. The costs are comparable and so is the spirit of adventure. If in 20 years there are 20,000 canoeists looking for white-water, and all the rivers have been dammed from one end of the state to the other, there will be no way of reclaiming that lost resource of running water. There is, of course, no way of predicting such a growth rate for white-water canoeing, but if the past experience of recreation (ie. skiing and snowmobiling) holds true, then white-water canoeing can only expand. While white-water canoeing is only one activity, we are sure that there are other unforeseen uses, in recreational and other areas, which could not be met if the free-running rivers were all dammed.

Liz Hull, I'm from Suffield and I speak with regard to S.B. 298, as former chairman of the White Water Committee of the Appalachian Mountain Club. The AMC for the past twenty years has had a program of recreational white water sport for canoes and kayaks, on rivers through-out the state. During the past seven years I have become intimately acquainted with many of Connecticut's rivers which are admirably suited to this type of recreational program through the purity of their waters and the beauty of the surrounding areas. A bill such as S.B. 298 is urgently needed. The rivers are not to be either unfavorably exploited or allowed to deteriorate because of inadequate legislative protection. I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

John E. Hibbard, I am from Hebron, I am employed as Secretary and Forester of the Connecticut Park and Forest Association, I have some comments on several of the bills that you have before you this morning. I would like to register in support of S.B. 298 and I believe that you have heard adequate testimony of that proposal. You have before you H.B. 5218, H.B. 5699 which would include the lands designated as wetlands under the provisions of the open space tax law, I presented some information some information on these two bills and a written statement last week. S.B. 404 and S.B. 661 would require the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality when highways would run through park lands, water sheds and other types of resources of a valuable nature. These two are embodied and recommendation 381 of the Governor's Committee on Environmental Policy. S.B. 405 and S.B. 636 would

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 3, 1971

up such a system without providing for some public participation and comment prior to the execution of such long term lease agreements. I recognize that H.B.6353 was proposed by the Conservation Commission of the Conservation Committee of the Bar Association. However, there are other bills I have commented on before which accomplish many of the same purposes as presented in this bill. Specifically, H.B.5218 and H.B.5699 would allow wetlands to be considered as open-space under the provision of the present law. We'd like to defer any comment on H.B.6700 until a final drafting of the bill would appear. Historically we have not favored consolidation of agencies, we do support the creation of a council on environmental quality and we would like to look specifically at any proposal that would be contained in H.B. 6700 when it is completed. I would hope the Committee would hold a hearing on it. H.B.6707 would allow planning and zoning commissions to require that lands be dedicated for schools and recreation purposes in their zoning ordinances. I think this is a desirable thing, and it has been done in some towns, but if we accomplish this by allowing it legislatively it may clear up some questions. There have been some law-suits on these dedication of land requirements. One in Danbury required four per cent of the land to be dedicated and I think it was upheld in the court, then another one in a town which required 10% was upheld in the court. H.B.7080 would allow funds for open-space received from the Federal Government and appropriated by the legislature in a bonding authorization to be used for both acquisition and development. I think this is desirable to consider this at this point in time. Several towns have acquired about all of the open-space that they intend to acquire and they are seeking funds for development. I think the legislature was wise in the beginning to specify that the funds could only be used for acquisition. But I do think some of them could be made available for development. H.B.7095 modifies the present land-owner liability law which still is difficult to administer. If the Committee is not in favor of adopting the model act as has been suggested previously, these two changes might be appropriate and necessary in the existing law. We don't take any position on H.B.7221 allowing the Park and Forest Commission to sell certain buildings in the American Legion State Forest. However, we do feel that the funds received from the sale of these buildings, if there eventually sold and this legislation doesn't direct the sale, it would just allow it. We feel these funds should be used for future acquisition. These two forests were American Legion, and the adjacent People's Forest were acquired almost a 100% by private money so we would see no need to put any receipts from sale of buildings back into the general fund. The People's Forest was acquired through the efforts of our association in getting public subscriptions, back in the 30's. The American Legion also raised money through the various posts and acquired the American Legion Forest as a memorial to World War I Veterans. I'd like to go on to just a couple Senate Bills. I think S.B.795 would provide for the appraisals on open-space acquisition to be paid for by the state. This may be desirable. I have some concern about the S.B.818 as I interpret it. This would go contrary to the 69 legislation which

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

FINANCE

**PART 1
1-329**

**1971
Index**

an incentive to large developers to leave some of his land open. This concept planners are urging metropolitan areas all the time.

This letter addressed to Rep. Spain (mentioned in the message above) Dear Representative Spain, I understand that the Finance Committee will be hearing the following bills on February 10th....5665, 6555, H 6556 H 6564, H 5218 and H 5699. I would like to indicate my fullest support of the House Bills mentioned. Since at this writing, one rather the bills are apparently not yet printed, it is difficult to be specific...but relative to 5665. I strongly urge that there be some method of recapturing taxes on land no longer kept as open space. I would like to question whether the 10 percent tax on what's been deferred shouldn't be a much larger percentage. I hope that you will consider this. Sincerely R.G. Worcester, Chairman Simsbury Conservation Commission.

Rep. Clynes: Thank you.

Ralph Engels, representing the Connecticut State Grange: I think everything has been said here today, so I won't try to go into a lot of extra detail, but, we would prefer to see 490 kept the way it is. But if there are inequities in this law, we hope that they can be corrected as simply as possible without losing the services of Public Act 490. We have looked over Commissioner Gills recommendations and bills applying to them, we find, them acceptable to us and urge your favorable consideration to these bills. Thank you.

Rep. Clynes: Thank you.

John Tarrant, of the Tax Department: One of the items in the preamble of 490 when it was first enacted in 1963. Mentioned that the law was to prevent the transfer of farm land to more intensive uses. I submit to you this has not been the fact. Public Act 490 has not preventive the transfer to more intensive uses when the price is right. So, we need a rollback. I stand before you in favor of the rollback bills that are before you today. I would prefer that we have a complete rollback, for five years and after five years leave the owner do what he wants with the land. Even these bills that require the increase transfer tax I think should get it over with in five years. Take the 10 percent and put it there over five years, rather than stretch it out to ten. I think that there is no question on the need for rollback and for the first time I see people even in the farm industry advocating some sort of rollback. Even Dr. White who was the obstetrician at the birth of this idea back in 1963 he favored a rollback and he has favored it since and he has written books on it, and I have my own ad hoc committee report which describes Dr. White's position, on these various things and here is one of the items that he says. He admits that many landowners

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

FINANCE

**PART 3
727-1114**

1971

Rep. Della Vecchia: they are hamstrung by the fact that they do not wish to go into the inaudible of developing a community action program, therefore, I feel that this Committee should consider this bill and give it a good report. Any questions.

Rep. Clynes: Thank you.

Rep. Platt: Member of the 121st district. Members of the Finance Committee, it's like coming home to sit through your hearing today. I do have a special interest in one bill, but my reason for coming here - I had an opportunity this morning to spend some time with you and I enjoyed your meeting very much. The bill that I have reference to is number 5218 which corrects an omission in the CLEAN WATER BILL which was passed in the last Session of the Legislature. This bill has a joint approval from the Environment Committee which heard it earlier in the Session. It merely puts the wetlands which are so designated and authorized under the Act; give them the same rights as we have for the farm land, forest land, recreational land and encourages land owners to keep this land, about the only thing there is left for the land owner now is pride of ownership and if the taxes are not too exorbitant I think we can encourage some of them to keep this land. We have two pending suits in my area which I don't think this thing would probably effect, but we have others who are being assessed on the basis of building lots at \$3,500 to \$5,000 an acre for this land which has you people know, they have no means of getting anything out of - except pride of ownership - or perhaps selling it to the State if they so desire, it's about all they can do. I feel that if this is put on the list as open space and checking with my assessor, he tells me that this probably can go down as low as \$25.00 an acre which probably is enough to encourage many people to keep it. I don't know what the tax assessors group will set as a valuation on this land, but they will I'm sure they will set some figure as guide lines for the cities and towns to go by. I hope that your Committee will give this bill a favorable report and hope that it can be included in the wet-land Act to make it really more effective. Thank you very much.

Rep. Clynes: Any questions. It was nice having you back Clarence, we have another meeting tonight at 7:30 in Tolland and if you enjoy are company that much. I have no other speakers in the list. Is there anyone else here

J. B. Thompson I had been prepared to go with my usual material. I would again address Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I had hoped that Mr. Lieberman and Mr. Bolber who have taken the first opportunity, however, I think I can provide you with a very graphic picture

HB5218

J. B. Thompson: of what has happened in the industry over the last 20-25 years. We have a five page brochure prepared "The need for Mass Transportation" Gentlemen: The matter of air and water pollution as well as the traffic problems are a source of great concern and while it is frightening it is well to bring it to the attention of the public. Trying to picture this wonderful world of ours as going out of existence in another twenty or thirty years is just too horrible. While it might not mean much to us older people it certainly will mean much to our children and their children. This problem which might have such grave results cannot be treated lightly. It must be dealt with by men of knowledge and most of all, men with courage. We are all well aware of the lack of concern shown by many people who will not try to see the dangers that lie in the future. The gravity of these conditions are being made known from the President of the country right down the line. Drastic changes are called for. Established ways of life will, no doubt be interrupted or changed completely. Mass reluctance will be chief problem to overcome. However, it must be done if we are to survive, so we are led to believe. According to information published in State wide newspapers, it seems that about 90% of air pollution and traffic hazards. Being in the transportation business for over thirty-two years I feel qualified to speak on this subject. The need for mass transportation was shown during the years of World War II. With the shortages of car fuels, tires and cars, it was up to transportation to fill a very important chore in the winning of the war. The initial effort was to get the workers there so that they could produce the tools of victory. The efforts of the Transportation industry were highly commended by President Truman and others when victory was achieved. With the war over, a great change came about in this country. The automobile age was upon us. This wonderful change brought about prosperity, jobs and new roads, for coast to coast travel. It brought about the use of trucks and it hurt the railroad commerce. After twenty-five years it also brought about air pollution which is slated to destroy us in another twenty-five years unless we act now. It is my sincere belief that the days of private ownership in the transportation business, so vitally needed in this dangerous era are over. What owners have had to do, to stay in business (make a profit) is the very thing that is ruining the transportation business, so vitally needed in this dangerous era. There is only one way to succeed in this business and that is to carry passengers. When your passengers drop away then you have to raise fares. Both of these factors result in the decline, and pretty soon there is no mass transit, or the cities and towns are forced to take over. When this occurs, it is usually after the business has been

J. B. Thompson: milked dry. This has been the history of the bus service throughout the nation since the end of World War II. I do not say this in criticism of private ownership. To stay alive, it was necessary, to have a profit. In the year of 1961, the legislature enacted into law, a bill providing for a Transit Authority if private ownership faltered. The Public Act Bill is No. 507. Private ownership, when it faltered just stayed in business by cutting service and raising fares. At one time, here in Connecticut, the Connecticut Company, owner of the bus service had over two thousand employees. Today, and I am an employee of the Connecticut Company, I'm the Union Representative for all the Division of the State and we have about 700 people. Laws have been enacted in the control of the use of Motor Vehicles in the past. Perhaps, we shall have to make more laws. It cannot be classified as infringing upon a person's rights if automobile curtailment is in the interest of public safety. In my experience, as a driver, and as an executive of the bus driver's union. I agree with the statement made by Mr. Charles Chaves, Assistant Planner of the C.R.F.A., that Monorails are not for this area. I do not have much hope for rail buses, it takes too much time to get on and off the railroad. Paving two tracks for bus use would speed things along but this seems very expensive according to the reports. This is supposedly to cost \$1. million a mile. The Triple A reports, which I have been able to gather, show that there are 160 thousand cars coming in and out of New Haven every day. Most of these cars have only the driver. The traffic tie-up would be a thing of the past if these cars were not on the road. We would not need special lanes for buses to travel on, If we are interested in fast moving traffic, the bus can get in almost as fast as a car does today, if we do not have the five-ten thousand cars in front of us at every light. During the war years, with the fare rate eight cents per passenger, The Connecticut Company carried over one hundred forty million passengers per year and made money. The people have to be put back on the buses. First bus riding must be attractive. Second thought must be given to passenger service, not to profit. Third we must go after the passengers. We failed to do this years ago when they started to move away. It was easier to cut service and raise fares. Today we are interested in mass survival. This is the prime consideration. Many arguments can be made in behalf of other interests, but can you argue against 90% car exhausts that cause pollution. I believe that if people can be made to realize it is their lives we are talking about, and not bus profits and if the bus service can be made a lot cheaper than driving their own car, this change can take place in a very short time. There is no

J. B. Thompson: doubt that mass transit, operated by the city and surrounding towns would have to be subsidized. I think that if a person was transported to and from work for 15¢, let's say, you would see reluctance disappear in most cases. The argument for this would be that present parking spaces provided for workers by companies could be used for other purposes and this might reflect in better and greater tax for the city. The round fare trip could be the issuance of a return card or some kind of paper or whatever when payment is first made. Some inducement like this is necessary. I think there is some merit to the plan for perimeter parking lot. However this should be for people coming in from areas further away than the parking lots. If you can envision 160 thousand cars not on the road, you can readily see that time can be made by the bus. The bus is not slow, it is the cars that slows the buses down, I think we all agree to that. As an appointed member of the Connecticut State Safety Commission, and this is Tom Kelley that prepared this, I can also see a marked reduction in the number of fatalities that mar the pleasure of our driving. In closing I would like to say again, this expression on my part is solely in the interest of doing what I think is necessary and in no way to criticize owners or others who may not agree. One last word in regards to the Public Utilities Commission, and again this is not meant as criticism, they have had to go along with bus curtailment every time the Connecticut Company asked for it. While the best interests of the Public is their responsibility, they have had to let people go without proper service because it was necessary for the Bus Company to make profits. Again profits have no place in mass transportation. The cities listed here are already operating their bus service with a Transit Authority. Boston, Providence, Miami, Philadelphia, New York, Rochester, Syracuse, Cleveland, Washington and many others. Here in New Haven, in the past decade, and again no criticism of the present owner, we are operating with a greatly reduced service. And I might add they are going to get the buses off the street at 7:00 P.M. and this will come about very shortly. I've just got two more pages, if you will bear with me. A resolution by the Amalgamated membership of the State of Connecticut - this takes in those members of C.R. AND L. And the Connecticut Company. We share the view of Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, that "public transit is so important that we must look at its financing much like any other public service." The constantly increasing fares charge for public transportation are in reality a form of regressive taxation - a tax imposed upon working people, the poor, the aged, the infirmed - for a public service from which all inhabitants and users of the central city benefit, including the automobile driver who uses the bus only when there is snow and ice on the ground. Our only chance for low fares and

J. R. Thompson: and adequate service is to replace private transit with public transportation by and on behalf of the whole people, as Secretary Volpe has said. But public transportation alone is not enough. Unless we can keep fares down, transit will continue to decline under public ownership and operation, so long as the community relies solely upon the fare box to provide needed transit services. Fare box revenues, whatever the level, will never be sufficient to meet the true transit needs of the community. The recurring pattern has been that transportation services will be cut back year by year while ridership on the remaining services declines and fares increase. In this vicious cycle, which we contend is totally contrary to the public interest, transit employees lose job opportunities and suffer, worsening positions in their employment because adequate and needed transportation services are not being furnished to the public. The Amalgamated Transit Union, through its newly formed Connecticut joint legislative conference and Conn. State Labor Council shall take all appropriate action to oppose any further fare increases on the Conn. Co. and C.R. & L. public transit system, and to seek legislation providing financial assistance to Mass Transit on the local, state and federal levels, from general tax funds, in amounts not only sufficient to hold fares at present levels, but, in fact, to reduce or eliminate them: and be it further resolved that this Amalgamated Transit Union and the Connecticut Joint Legislative Conference and the Connecticut State Labor Council, urges and supports the prompt acquisition of all private transit companies in the state by public bodies, provided adequate employee protections are included.

Rep. Clynes: Thank you. Any questions. I declare this hearing over. 12.25.