

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-546		439	5	2	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Transportation</i> 290 • <i>Transportation</i> 285 • <i>Transportation</i> 293 • <i>Transportation</i> 685 • <i>Transportation</i> 687 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1818-1819 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2610

H-111

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 4
1451-1967**

It is probably long overdue in our approach and, for that reason, as I say, it has great significance and hopefully, we'll see more meaningful substantiative changes in the entire attitude and procedure of our courts and we hope that the court personnel will be similarly inspired to offer expeditious to this kind of thing.

GERALD F. STEVENS, 122nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the Majority Leader and Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in supporting this bill. To a person who does not have experience with the Circuit Court this may seem like a minor bill, but it certainly is not. It's a major step forward. The Judiciary Committee is to be complimented for taking this action. And I don't say this lightly. The Circuit Court has been in operation for approximately ten years and I think it is only proper that we, in the legislature, now, are making a significant review of the functions, operations of the Circuit Court and, most importantly, trying to redirect it to serve the people of the state who come in contact with that court. The Circuit Court handles the largest number of cases of any other court in our system. Many offenses on the violations list, in fact most, are minor offenses. As the Majority Leader has said, there's no reason to take up the time of the court or of the people who have been summoned to court, sitting around waiting to pay a minor traffic offense. This is a major step forward in correcting a log jam in the circuit court and we are very

pleased to join in supporting this measure.

ROBERT D. KING, 48th District:

Mr. Speaker, I would join in those who support the bill. I have one question, however, which results, I think, from my own lack of time to do a bit of research that I have felt I should have done on this bill. That is, in reading it at this point I noticed no distinction is made for minors, and I am wondering... I am frank to confess that I haven't done the research on it...if this bill might not be in conflict with some existing statute concerning minors and should there not be a repealer or at least a modification of any bill relating to minors which might be in conflict with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the gentleman from the 81st care to respond?

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA, 81st District:

Mr. Speaker, through you, to the Representative...Representative King, I don't believe there is any conflict with any existing statute insofar as the reference to minors here. All it does is allow a minor to pay his fine by mail as long as his parent sign the ticket. There's no conflict at all.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 493, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 0599,

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

May 28, 1971

18.

signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay/ The ayes have it.
The bill is adopted.

THE CLERK:

Page 11, Cal. 956, File 1307, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Transportation on Substitute S.B. 411. An Act Concerning the Use of Studded Tires.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, this bans the use of studded tires on the highway between October 30 and, excuse me April 30 and Oct. 15. The Department of Transportation has found that thwn the warm summer months come the studs tend to add a bad effect on the highways. It does not ban them on emergency vehicles. They are specifically exempt from the law.

I urge passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 597, File 1509, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Transportation Substitute S.B. 439, An Act Concerning Weight of Vehicles and Trailers Engaged in Construction Work.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani/

May 28, 1971

19.

SENATOR MONDANI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, this naturally does away with a permit system for construction vehicles to reach the 73,000 pound load limit. Its limited to four more axel vehicles. And it has the provision that the Commissioner of Transportation may restrict the roads that they travel on. Its acceptable to the Department. I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all thise in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 962 , File 1326. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Finance Substitute S.B. 1548 An Act Providing for Legislative Budget Review of the State's Working Capital (Revolving) Funds.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Rimer.

SENATOR RIMER:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 1
1-337**

**1971
Index**

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

restaurant facilities on the Merritt Parkway, I feel that a driver should not have to get off the Merritt Parkways in order to have a good meal in a decent restaurant. Transportation Commissioner could put out for bid the complete cost of the proposed building and maintenance. The Commission could go out for bid a land lease with a prerequisite that a certain building be built by the lessee and a certain percentage of the income be paid by the lessee, to the State for rent. It could be possible that by doing this the State would obtain modern restaurant facilities at no cost and also obtain an income from such facilities. Thus, I suggest a favorable report on this bill. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Sen. Power did you want to speak on this bill?

Sen. Power: Mr. Chairman, members of the Transportation Committee, my name is Sen. Ed Power of the 30th District. I'd like to speak in favor of S.B. 439, and what this will do would be to allow, I believe its 5843 is identical to 439. What this will do is permits a four axle vehicle to carry maximum loads of 73,000 pounds and its apparently considerable less on permitted maximum loading of all axles to a gross weight of 76,000 pounds. On a three or four it is that its rear axle permits an increase or decrease of axle weights through the regulation of air pressure. Probably, this meets with the approval of the Transportation Department they think that this would be a good bill and I understand that this would be extremely helpful to the people engaged in the construction. Just as an aside, I think that maybe today is a good day to talk about this, because there will be several people of Irish heritage who will be carrying some pretty good loads. So, maybe this kind of a truck would be good for use this evening. I beg your urgent and favorable consideration of this bill. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you back to H.B. 379. Is there any opposition? If there is no opposition we will now close the hearing on 379. Is anyone here to speak on any bills?

Mr. Parkhurst: First of all, I'd like to apologize for not being here yesterday, but my bulletin said today. I'm Robert M. Parkhurst, first selectmen of the Town of Montville. Two of the bill I would like to speak on this morning are similar in nature, they both would benefit the Town of Montville. One bill is 5141 and that was introduced by Rep. Cohen and bill no. 5517 introduced by Rep. Holdridge. The benefit that would be derived from each area, speaking in regard to Rep. Cohens bill certainly would be an asset to all towns concerned. The Towns of Salem, Montville, Waterford, and New London. Montville would be deriving more benefits from this because we have more mileage connected with this particular project than any other towns, we have approximately seven miles of this road through the Town of Montville. This road runs from our North boundary clear thru to the South boundary. Its a main artery, it serves approximately 500 families, we have one large development that is built on this particular road in the Montville Manor section of Montville and there are 400 plus homes or families in that particular area. This certainly would be of benefit to the Town of Montville. We have reconstructed 354 running through Colchester down to Route 82 which is a state highway at the present time but it terminates there. Right across Route 82 the Old Colchester Road continues with an extension of Route 354 South of this

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

problem economically, in that there are now no consumers of scrap metal, reprocessed metal in this area. All the material has to be shipped down to Pittsburg, this area is in somewhat of a competitive disadvantage. The possibility of utilizing the vehicle for pickup to there designed capacity would, of course, relieve that economic squeeze to a certain extent. I would like to further point out the fact that it is rather difficult for our industry to conceive why your trucks loaded with scrap metal and picked up at a plant are not capable of carrying 40,000 pounds, whereas, the construction industry trucks doing the exact same thing is capable of carrying 40,000 pounds. We would like to urge that not only the scrap metal industry but other manufacturing and other types of industry within the State of Connecticut feel that a truck certainly the construction is justified in having 40,000 pounds on their trucks, then we feel that we are similarly justified, and in fact, it would be an economic boom to our industry the economic boom would be more than matched by the benefits of fewer trips from the highways, less air pollution and, of course, less traffic. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Any questions? Thank you Mr. Cohen. Anyone else in favor of S.B. 382 and H.B. 6934?

Mr. Blasko: My name is John Blasko, executive vice president of the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut and if I may Mr. Chairman, and at the same time direct my remarks in addition to bill no. 382 also to 439 and to H.B. 6328, these are all related to this matter. Now, to go over them point by point, first as to the proposed weights here we have new developments in the industry, when these weights for the varying types of units were set up it was impossible for users of equipment to get more than 8 or 10,000 pounds on the front axle and this is the important element now with the development of new equipment this, these new trucks can get anywhere from 18 to 20,000 pounds on that front axle, and now with power steering, of course, it gives a far greater safety and mobility to the unit but most important from the standpoint of safety as well as the use and protection of the highway a better distribution of the load, In connection with the proposal to increase the weight from 32,000 pounds to 40,000 pounds for four wheel vehicles this is currently permitted for construction units, and the ridiculous part of this situation is this, that a contractor or a rather, lets take an oil dealer who has a truck hauling asphalt up to a construction job authorized to haul 40,000 pounds that same oil tanker hauling oil to your home or to mine is restricted to 32,000 pounds and it just doesn't make sense to authorize 40,000 pounds on one hand for one unit and only 32,000 pounds for another. Increased from 53,800 pounds to 60,000 pounds on a three axle unit you have exactly the same situation whereby with 22,400 on each of the rear axles, now it is possible to get in the area of 18, to 20,000 pounds on the steering axle which would raise the permissive gross rate of this unit to 60,000 pounds and incidentally, a great many of these units, right now because of their dire need in the construction industry are moving under permits from the Highway Department and I'm referring to Transit Mix Concrete type units and again it seems unreasonable to permit this type of unit on the one hand and at the same time, not extend it to the general trucking industry. Getting down to the four axle unit you have the same axle

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

gross weight exceeds 73,000 pounds. Section 14-269 of the State Statute is amended to include this reference to four-or-more axle equipment. In recent years the four axle vehicle has been widely adopted by our industry and is considered by most of its owners to be the most ideal type for over the road use of all heavy duty trucks. Our requested maximum of 73,000 pounds, is considerably less than the permitted maximum loading of all axles to a gross weight of 76,400 pounds. A feature of this vehicle is its air axle which permits an increase or decrease of axle weight through the regulation of air pressure, thus permitting a balance of weight from one axle in relation to another. The operation of this vehicle offers greater saving to its owner which in turn results in greater saving to his customer who ranges from the individual house builder to the State of Connecticut. By authorizing the increase in gross weight the State of Connecticut will realize considerable additional revenue in the form of registration fees, etc. In order to adequately service the demanding conditions of most types of construction we, the materials suppliers, are restricted to a choice of truck equipment designed with heavy duty components, a short wheel base, and a minimum number of axles, this is for freedom of movement to best service the job. I might add as a final point, the use of this axle is limited almost wholly to the construction industry and represents a minor fraction of all trucks using Connecticut highways, so we do not see that this will create any additional burden on the number of pieces of equipment involved. The association mentioned herein respectfully requests your support of our bill.

Rep. O'Dea: Anyone else in favor of these bills?

Mr. Williston: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Robert M. Williston representing the Department of Transportation, speaking on S.B. 439 and H.B. 6936. This bill amends Section 14-269 of the General Statutes by exempting motor vehicles, with four or more axles, that are engaged in construction work, from the gross weight limitations of Section 14-268. The Department of Transportation does not object to the intent of this bill; however, we would like an opportunity for further review regarding a provision that the Commissioner of Transportation shall have authority to restrict these vehicles from any specific highway or bridge and may wish to offer a substitute bill for consideration by this committee. It is therefore, requested that committee action on this bill be withheld and we will forward additional comments as soon as possible.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Williston. Anyone else in favor? Anyone opposed to the bill?

Lt. Griffin: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'm Michael Griffin, State Police Department, Traffic Division. We would like to go on record as being opposed to S.B. 439 and H.B. 6936 both concerning weight of vehicles and trailers engaged in construction work. The State Police Department is opposed to this proposed legislation increasing the maximum allowable gross weight for four or more axled vehicles with pneumatic tires from the present sixty-seven thousand four-hundred pounds to seventy-three thousand pounds if these vehicles are engaged in construction work or in supplying or transporting materials or equipment for public or private construction projects. This statute, if enacted will result in vehicles which are not capable of

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 3
675-968**

1971

THURSDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 8, 1971

assistance to persons and business displaced by public construction. It should be noted that public law 91646, AN ACT CONCERNING UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES OF 1970, which is signed by the President, on January 2, 1971, increases the relocation payments and benefits previously authorized by Federal law and presently authorized by Sections 13-a-81a through 13a-81L, and Sections 8-228 and 8-239 of the 1969 Supplement to the General Statutes. Section 13a-81a, through 13a-81L deal primarily with the Transportation Department and sections 8-228 to 8-239 deal with other agencies. For your information H.B. 7038 was heard before this Committee on March 31, 1971, and at this time I submitted a substitute H.B. 7038, which amended Sections 13a-81a through 13a-81L to bring into line the payments and benefits provided for in the Federal Law previously mentioned. As I explained in my summary of substitute H.B. 7038 the benefits and payments to persons and business are substantially increased. Further this bill 7038, is effective on passage, in addition I point out that on all federal projects the federal government will pay the full cost of relocation benefits and payments up to \$25,000 on each individual person and business relocation. I must point out that it must be realized that substitute H.B. 7038 concerns itself only with persons and business displaced by projects involving the State Department of Transportation. The bill today if it were drafted along these lines, would, of course, include everybody else. This is a matter of course, for somebody else, but your favorable report on substitute H.B. 7038 and its passage at an early date is earnestly and respectfully urged. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Neurik: Anyone else to speak on the bill? The hearing is closed. Next bill is 1755 AN ACT CONCERNING THE USE OF TOLL TICKETS. Anyone in favor? Anyone opposed to 1755? The hearing is closed on this bill. The next bill is 5843 AN ACT CONCERNING WEIGHT OF VEHICLES AND TRAILERS ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION WORK. Anyone speak in favor?

Mr. Turton: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Robert Turton, I'm Executive Secretary of the Connecticut Road Builders Association, here to speak in favor H.B. 5843. I'll not belabor the Committee, because I believe this, the S.B. 439 introduced by Sen. Mondani, and H.B. 6936 introduced by Rep. Liskov were heard, these bills were heard on the 17th of March, and exactly the same verbage as the present bill. You might say this bill would permit the construction industry to use modern construction equipment, which is greater safety, and greater economy for both the industry and the State of Connecticut, without any increase in the present axle loads. Thank you very much.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Turton. Anyone else to speak in favor of this bill? Any opposition to this bill? The hearing is closed on 5843. The next bill is 7190 AN ACT CONCERNING TOWN AID FOR ROADS. Anyone in favor? Anyone opposed? Anyone want to comment on those bills? We'll close the hearing on 7190. H.B. 8252 AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL ON ROUTE 207. Anyone in favor? Any opposition?

Mr. Mancusso: I'm Tony Mancusso and I represent the State Traffic Commission. H.B. 8252 is the same thing as bill 1009 and we spoke against that for the following reasons: The present statutes provide the traffic control signals on any highways to be installed only after approval, by the State Traffic Commission. The State Traffic Commission in accordance with the authority granted to it has established definite warrants that must be met before a permit to install a traffic signal is issued. The purpose of this pro-

THURSDAY

TRANSPORTATION

APRIL 8, 1971

Mr. Meek: Mr. Chairman, I'm Richard Meek, Executive Vice President of Connecticut Automotive Trade Association. We object to the wording of this bill, it is so broad that it would prevent the sale of scrap engines to _____ down in the haven for disposal of scrap. It makes no distinction between, retail sales and wholesale sales. And is so broadly worded that there would be little change of getting any salvage out of these engine blocks after the vehicles are wrecked. I submit that the salvage dealers perform a valuable service to the State by recovering from wrecked cars, valuable components and this certainly is reflected in your insurance rate. These are by and large sold to salvage dealer by insurance companies and it reduces their costs of doing business. If your going to move in this area why it certainly should be applied to retail sales of these rebuilt engines, not just scrap engines that are pulled out of a, the yards.

Sen. Mondani: You don't object to the concept?

Mr. Meek: The concepts alright if their selling them to a customer for use that's another matter, but the common practice is if they're sold they're sold to a do it yourself mechanic, so they're sold wholesale and the man take them and work on them and put them in their own cars. I see no objection to that, but if there is any representation made about the engine, and I think this is generally true, rebuilding of engines has got to be quite big business, and I think most of these companies do warrant them and they should. Thank you.

Mr. Neurik: While you were asking me a question I missed a previous bill, 5843. I would just like to state that when the other bill 439 was heard before, the Committee asked the people that had some disagreement to get together and submit a substitute bill which I did yesterday and I gave it to Mr. O'Dea yesterday, so that there is a bill, substitute bill for 439 which has agreement with the people represented by Sherman Stocks and which included a contractors, we are in agreement. Thank you.

Sen. Mondani: Anyone else in opposition to 9008? The hearing is closed. 9007 AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL REGULATION OF THE OPERATION OF SNOWMOBILES. We had a group of snowmobile bills before and is there anyone who wishes to speak in favor of this one today? Anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this bill? Hearing is closed on 9007. 6080 AN ACT CONCERNING AMENDMENT OF THE GENERAL STATUTES 15-144 having to do with retail boat dealers.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, I'm attorney Allen Green from New Britain, and I represent the Connecticut Marine Trades Association, as their general consul, and have been associated with that organization for a number of years. After I finish speaking there's a Gentlemen from the association directly who would like to dress you on this bill. I'd like to speak with you briefly on two aspects of it, first of all, the need for the bill and the second point the nature of the bill itself and what it purports to cover. As far as the needs for the bill is concerned the situation is properly fairly obvious. How clerks close their offices, let's say at 4:00 o'clock, 4:30 of a given afternoon, and a person is going away for the weekend and buys a boat, and wants to take it with him, particularly a trailerable boat, or for that matter a boat that, a larger boat at a marina, and he finds that he's in this situation where he isn't going to get the use of this item for the entire weekend unless he can borrow some dealer plates, If somebody from the Boat Safety Commission will mention later that that kind of a plate is available, it's a very costly