

HB 7842

PA 645 (Vetoed)

1971

Transportation

311-318, 325-336

House

4710-4742

Senate

3289-3292

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 1
1-337**

**1971
Index**

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Sen. Petroni(continued): bill, which clearly sets forward the projects that we feel should be approved. The estimated bond requirements for these five projects is three hundred thousand dollars. Most of them, I've discussed, as far as Bethel is concerned, I have pointed out to the Committee that Bethel is sort of isolated from I-84 and from the new, proposed route 7. And certainly the growth of Bethel will depend a great deal on connector roads and I certainly hope that the Committee, when they deliberate on these matters, will consider the difficult position that Bethel is in, as far as attracting the necessary industries, because of its isolation. The others are self-explanatory and I certainly hope that the Committee will give their serious consideration to the matters set forth in that bill.

H. B. 7848 was introduced by Rep. Curtis, who is probably at a Roll Call, like all the other members who are not able to be here now; and I am sure that she wants favorable action on this bill. From knowing the area, I know that we have had a great many serious accidents on route 34 and purpose of this bill would be to take out some of the hazardous conditions, blind spots, the rocks, and dangerous curves that exist on route 34. And, it would be, of course, be necessary to reconstruct it and she does not estimate the number of dollars it would require because at this time she did not have the necessary estimate. Thank you very much.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you, Senator. Rep. Avcollie?

Rep. Avcollie: Mr. Chairman, before we were interrupted for a Roll Call, I had been addressing myself to H. B. 7839. with regard to a route from Naugatuck, westerly to the Oxford Airport. And, before the next Roll Call, I would like to address myself (there will be many, Mr. Chairman) to a matter that is even more important, not only to Naugatuck, but to the entire state of Connecticut.

This is H. B. 7842 (Rep. Avcollie, Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROUTE 8 FROM NAUGATUCK TO SEYMOUR. This calls for the completion of Route 8 in Naugatuck, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to point out on the map, if I may, this stretch on the map, is route 8. You will notice, on the very end, near Bridgeport, it is marked in red - which means that funds have been allocated. And, you will notice in the middle, there is a portion on the right, which represents the highway from route 63 in Naugatuck to North Street in Seymour. Now, the red coding is a little bit deceptive, for one to look at this map; because that red code says that funds have been provided. In fact, six point six million dollars were provided during the last Session for acquisition, design and planning. There have

5
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Rep. Avcollie(continued): been no funds provided for completion. Rep. Sarasin and I petitioned out this bill, on the floor, during the last Session, as you probably remember. And we were fortunate in obtaining an additional five million dollars to commence a design and plan. It is our information, right now, that this highway would not be completed until 1978 or longer.

Gentlemen, it is more than just a sense of urgency that I want to communicate to you today. As far as I am concerned, as Rep. of Naugatuck and a Rep. of the state of Connecticut, its an absolute farce that this portion of route 8 remains incomplete. And, I, for one, and I am sure that Rep. Sarasin will join with me, in saying that I expect this bill should be on the floor of the House - one way or another. I confronted the Roads and Bridges Commission two years ago, with the fact that two or three lives were being lost. I showed this group a copy of the Naugatuck News, February 15, 1969, which tabbed this stretch of highway as "nightmare alley". I documented death after death, after death before this Committee. And we were able to get five million more dollars. We had just scarcely adjourned our special Session, called for the purpose of adopting the budget, when in September we experienced yet another death on this highway. And, as I sit here before you, we are less than 24 hours away from burying our last death, yesterday morning, on route 8. And frankly, those of us in Naugatuck and Beacon Falls are just sick and tired of this highway being relegated to the pigeon holes in the state highway Commissions offices while we wait for this work to be done.

Route 8 was started, planned and designed back in the fifties, before I-84 was even a dream. Before Route 91 and 95 were even started. It just seems inconceivable to me that we should have to wait until 1978 or 1980 to finish this highway. There will be many more speakers after me on the subject, and I would ask that you give serious consideration to providing, in this budget, the bonding authorization to complete this stretch of road, which now is sticking out like a sore thumb. I know that Naugatuck and Beacon Falls are not the metropolitan areas that Hartford and New Haven are, that are served by these other large highways. But the people that ride on this highway are just as much human as those down on 91 and 95, and their deaths are just as tragic. And I don't seem to sound dramatic, I told this Committee two years ago, we are losing two and three lives a year; we continue to lose two or three lives. I would implore you to please get the Highway Commissioner to start this highway now, before we lose any more.

I wrote Gov. Dempsey in 1961 and placed the responsibility for the deaths on the shoulders of the Legislators who

6
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Rep. Avcollie(continued): not concerned enough to pass this Legislation and on every Administration official, and I do so again, today. This is not a dream - it is a reality - it is beginning to be a nightmare. And, I would ask you, please take a look at it. I ask you to come to Naugatuck. I think many of you have driven over this stretch. And it is not a highway, it is an abomination. It is not a road, it is hardly even a horse trail. And cars shouldn't even be permitted to drive on it, when we compare it to the systems of highways we are supposed to have here in the state. So, I would ask you, again, look at this highway, and please consider it. Not only for the sake of Naugatuck and Beacon Falls, but for the sake of the economic climate - for the sake of the public health and welfare in this entire area. This is drastic.

Chairman Mondani: Rep. Avcollie, you have thirty million dollars in here that will be needed to complete this?

Rep. Avcollie: This is the best estimate that we have when we framed it. If the highway department has better figures, I would urge them to put it in. I would presume that the highway department will point to their very nice blue brochure and indicate that this construction is not scheduled. And with all due respect to the comments that will be made about the scheduling; I would say schedule be damned - this highway must be finished. And I would like the highway department to come down and look at this mess. And, I wish that they had been at some of the wakes for people that we have waked because of this highway. I am not concerned with what their schedules are, this is a priority item. I think that it is the worst stretch of highway in the state of Connecticut. And I challenge anyone to show me one that is any worse. Thank you.

Rep. Mastrianni: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; I am Rep. from the 119th. District. I, also want to concur with what Mr. Avcollie has mentioned as far as route 8 from Seymour to Naugatuck. I traveled that route more than once, and it is very, very dangerous.

And, also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on in favor of H. B. 7698 (Rep. Mastrianni) AN ACT CONCERNING THE REDESIGN AND EXPANSION OF ACCESS AND EXIT RAMPS ON THE COMMODORE HULL BRIDGE IN DERBY. Mr. Chairman, the reason we are here today is the same reason Mr. Avcollie mentioned, as far as deaths. There have been two or more deaths right on that ramp, itself. Right now it is so bad that we have a "stop" sign there. And there are two or three accidents a week there, on this one section; from route 34, going on to the exit on Commodore Hull Bridge, onto route 8. And I would like to have something done, Mr. Chairman, because we also need better safety on that ramp. I thank you.

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Rep. Curtis?

Rep. Curtis: Thank you very much. I am Rep. from the 164th. District. I have a bill in which is H. B. 7848 (Rep. Curtis) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR RECONSTRUCTION OF A PORTION OF ROUTE 34 IN NEWTOWN. This happens to be a road which the highway department has already surveyed for truck-climbing-lanes, coming up from the dam, which would be in Monroe; coming up through the high hills there. This should be done. We have a great deal of truck traffic on this road. We also have very many blind spots, and we have had a number of deaths on this road. About a mile below my house there is one section where there is a hump in the road, where two sisters were killed a year ago, coming out of that road. There are protruding rocks, and it does seem to me that the highway department should do something to correct this very dangerous situation. There is no money in the bill - I do not have any idea how much it is going to cost to go ahead and complete this, but it is a very dangerous section of road, and I appeal for some help. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Are there any other Legislators? I guess not. We will start in order of the bills. We will take S. B. 710 (Sen. Ives, Rep. Johnson) AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXTENSION OF ROUTE 42 IN THE TOWN OF OXFORD. Any one in favor?

Mr. Norman Husted: Chairman of the Committee; I am First Selectman of Oxford. I would like to speak in favor of bill 710. This is a road that goes from Beacon Falls to 67. Some years ago, the highway took this portion over because there was a direct route from the center of Beacon Falls to the center of Oxford. Its been very helpful. Now, we would like to have this route continued to route 34. There is no route in Oxford that goes across Oxford. All our state roads go up and down, the opposite direction. And with the increase of people in Oxford, the increase in transportation, due to the airport; and many other things, we get a lot of traffic on our country roads and we would like to have a road that crosses the town, from 8 to 67 to 34. I have a letter here from our Road Study Committee, and from the Board of Selectmen. To save time, while I am here, if it is permissable, I would like to speak on two other bills?

I would like to speak in favor of bill 7842. You have heard a lot about this bill. I travel this road, twice a day, for quite a good many years, and the things that Rep. Avcollie has told you about this road, I am sure are true. It is a much needed highway.

I would also like to speak in favor of bill 7839. I think that this is another road that would help this area very much as we have the large airport with poor access roads to it. Thank you.

8
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Chairman Mondani: Thank you very much. Anyone else in favor of 710?

Mr. Mason: I am Republican Town Chairman in Oxford and I would like to speak in favor of the bill concerning the extension of route 42 in Oxford. We now have, as Mr. Husted pointed out, have state highways going in through, north and south. And we have a connection from route 8 to 42 to the center of town, which is 67. This brings the traffic to the center of town and is just a short distance to Naugatuck, to Seymour and Beacon Falls. But, it is also causing traffic, which has doubled, up to route 188. From route 188 to 34. Twenty years ago it was nothing but a group of dirt roads. And a summer colony. However, the town has grown and the summer colony has grown into expanded houses, been winterized, and now we have 15 to 20% of our population there. There is no direct route. Our Riverside Fire Department, for instance, has to take five to ten minutes extra, to get over to our first school, which is just off route 188, a quarter of a mile, going down to 67. In case of any disaster at the airport, where the fire engines or ambulance is called upon; this would be the last fire company to go to the airport. In fact, every other town has better transportation to the airport, than the Riverside section of Oxford, which would be right at Stevenson Dam. The Connecticut Light and Power Co., has graciously given us a good deal on 115 acres of land, which we are developing for a town at Jackson Cove, which is right in that area. So, in the summer the traffic has picked up to a point where they want to make a short-cut over to 67, they are using these back roads. Its gotten to the point where we are transporting the children in the winter (and I use the roads quite frequently) and I have to stop on each one of these roads to let a bus go by.

Also, during the summer, the traffic is heavy and at several points where you get two or three cars, you just have to stop. With Uniroyal going up there on the Oxford town line and the industry being in that section of town, most of the work force will come from Newtown, Monroe and Riverside, through this area. Yet there is no direct route 42. I think that this was included in about a quarter of a million dollar estimate, by our highway study committee in Oxford. Thank you very much.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Anyone else speaking in favor of 710?
Anyone opposed?

Mr. John Bentley: Department of Transportation. The Department cannot support the intent of these bills. An initial glance at the Oxford town map may give the impression that a connector between routes 67 and 34 in this area would be a worthwhile undertaking. Further investigation, however, reveals a very rugged terrain composed of steep hills and

9
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bentley(continued): valleys laced by a network of brooks which would indicate a prohibitively high construction cost. A rough estimate of the cost for this four and one half miles of improvement would be in the neighborhood of ten million dollars. The horizontal and vertical alignment of town roads in this area far below state standards and would, thereby, require major reconstruction for use in the extension of route 42.

In view of the extremely high cost of construction and the relatively low anticipated traffic volume to be served, the benefits to be derived from this improvement would not justify its cost. Furthermore, the department cannot support increasing the bond authorizations as provided by section 13a-198a of the statutes, at this time. These comments apply to H. B. 5509 as well as to S. B. 710, both dealing with route 42.

Chairman Mondani: Mr. Bentley, was this done during a survey or was it just a guess? Because, I noticed in this bill, they have two million dollars.

Mr. Bentley: We have done this in the office. This is not a thorough detailed cost estimate. It would take survey in the field and a considerable length of time and an appraisal of property, to get a really accurate figure. This is based on our experience with similar roads and terrain. Essentially it is a per-mile cost, that we have used here.

Chairman Mondani: Would you be opposed to it, if they could do it for two million - do you think in the department?

Mr. Bentley: We would be opposed if it required a new bonding authorization at this time. Even at two million, for the anticipated traffic that would be served - this would be a very costly undertaking.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Anyone else opposed?
S. B. 772 (Sen. Petroni) AN ACT CONCERNING A CONNECTOR FROM INTERSTATE ROUTE 84 IN DANBURY TO THE DANBURY HOSPITAL. Anyone in favor?

Dr. Nelson Gelfman: I am Associate Pathologist at the Danbury Hospital, resident of Ridgefield, Conn., and member of the Ridgefield Planning and Zoning Commission. From time to time, it has been proposed that in Ridgefield that a Medical Center housing an emergency room be built to serve that community that is now 18,000 people, and estimated to reach a saturation population of 30,000. With modern medical facilities costing as much as they do, and staffing being as difficult as it currently is; it has always seemed to me more sensible to spend funds facilitating the transport from Litchfield to Danbury Hospital. Which is a distance of approximately

10
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Dr. Gelfman(continued): eleven miles. Currently, that travel is by several miles of un-improved route 7; by 1.8 miles of I-84 and then by 1.4 miles of city streets. The hospital itself, is located only 0.4 of a mile from I-84. There is a road, running under I-84, at that point, and currently there are only four small houses and some empty land near the cemetery, in the area of the proposed ramp, that would give immediate and shortest access to the hospital.

I wanted to note further, that I-84 and the improved route 7, running together over this stretch of highway; and I wondered if consideration for this ramp might also be under the improvement of the new route 7.

The 1.4 miles through city streets, in good weather, without traffic and with favorable traffic lights, takes 3 to 5 minutes. There is a Jr. High School located adjacent to the hospital. The access to the high school is the same as the current access to the hospital, it is up a steep hill - if you run into that traffic it can take 10 to 15 minutes to complete that last 1.4 miles. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you, Doctor. Anyone else in favor?

Mr. John Creasy: Mr. Chairman; I am Administrator of the Danbury Hospital and I want to speak in favor of this bill 772. We see about 40,000 cases per year in our emergency room and about 20% of those come by ambulance. Now, since the Danbury Hospital is in about the population center of over one hundred thousand people, approximately over half of the cases come from the south and southeast portion, which use route 7, I-84, and then must come through the city of Danbury traffic in order to get to the hospital. This is an obstacle. Equally important are the 32,000 cases who come by car. Many of them are just as critically ill as those who come by ambulance. They do not have the advantages of lights, sirens and so on, so they have to be more aware of the street lights and traffic that this mile and half through the city of Danbury, creates.

We see nothing but continual growth. Our emergency room operation continues to grow each year, at about 10%. And so the problem is going to become worse, rather than better. This exit from I-84 at exit 6, would (as Dr. Gelfman pointed out) result in about 0.4 of a mile from 84 to the hospital, through practically a no-traffic area - as compared to one and a half miles through the city of Danbury, in a high-traffic area. I urge that this exit be created from 84 for the patients who come from the south and south east to the Danbury Hospital. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you very much. Anyone else in favor? Before I call opponents - Rep. Morris?

11
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Rep. Morris: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Transportation Committee; I want to speak to you on H. B. 8249. This is a bill, sponsored by me, by virtue of being called by 6 or 8 citizens who live in this immediate area. They are desirous of having a traffic control signal installed at the intersection of Stanley and Francis Street in New Britain, Conn. They tell me that several accidents have been caused at this intersection and they believe it is by virtue of having little or no traffic controls in this area. Your favorable report and support will be appreciated. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you, sir.

Rep. Sarasin: Mr. Chairman, I am Rep. from the 95th. District, which includes the towns of Beacon Falls, Seymour and Bethany. And I wish to H. B. 7842, introduced by Rep. Avcollie and myself. And, Rep. Avcollie, a few minutes ago was sitting before this Committee and discussing the problem that we have with route 8 - in that it has not been finished and does not appear to be finished in the very near future. The difficulty, I am sure you can see in just viewing the map - is that route 8 to Winsted from Shelton is a fully completed, limited access highway, except when you get to the southern part of Naugatuck, through the town of Beacon Falls to the northern part of Seymour. And it is in this area, which Rep. Avcollie has pointed out very well; that The Naugatuck Daily News has described route 8 as "nightmare alley"; that we are losing people at an alarming rate, and, that frankly, it just cannot go on.

Sometime ago, I wrote to Gov. Dempsey, and told him that it was time to stop playing games with people's lives, in regard to route 8. And we are very serious about this situation; it is something that simply cannot be allowed to continue. And, as already has been pointed out, it apparently gets relegated to the back shelves of the highway department. It is an issue that we feel very strongly about and it can't be done fast enough. We have been able to obtain some money for this, but not enough to get anything off the ground. And the longer it remains the way it is, the greater our problem becomes.

Through the town of Beacon Falls, route 8 is Main Street, it is a non-limited access, although it is a four-lane highway. For the person who comes down from Winsted, he doesn't realize that he has suddenly left a limited access 50 to 60 mile an hour highway; and is now in a 35 mile an hour zone. We have clocked gasoline tanker trucks, through Beacon Falls, doing 58 miles an hour. Now, this is our Main Street, because the highway department has not seen fit to rebuild this part of route 8. It is something, Gentlemen, that I hope will be done without any further delay

mr
18

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Chairman Mondani(continued): H. B. 7839 (Rep. Avcollie) AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RUBBER AVENUE IN NAUGATUCK. Anyone in favor? Sir, are you also speaking for route 8? We put those two together, 7839 and H. B. 7842 (Rep. Avcollie, Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROUTE 8 FROM NAUGATUCK TO SEYMOUR. Anyone wishing to speak on either one, you may address the both of them, it will be easier.

Mr. Peter Rolatori: I am Town Attorney for the town of Naugatuck, I would like to speak in favor of 7839. And Mayor Bessette is here, and other people from Naugatuck. But I would like to address my reasons for the importance of this project to State and National Defense. On Rubber Avenue, we presently have a National Guard Armory. This is primarily concerned with Armored Personnel Carriers. Also, Oxford is very close to the Armory and has an airport. And, we also have National Guard Helicopters which are stationed there in case of any emergency. So, from the point of view of National, State and local defense, in case there is a war or some kind of emergency, flood or other disaster; I believe that we have to have proper access to both the National Guard Armory and the Oxford Airport. And I think the most direct route would be through Rubber Avenue and on to the Oxford Airport. I believe it is the most direct route and in addition to that, Rubber Avenue is very critical, in that it is very close to the life-line of the Naugatuck Valley and that is route 63, route 8 and I-84. Also, the Oxford Airport is being used by many industrial plants such as Uniroyal. It is my understanding that jets will soon be using the Oxford Airport and it is very important to have access to the Airport, through the Rubber Avenue site.

I am sure that Mayor Bessette and others from Naugatuck will talk about the other aspects of widening this road. Gentlemen, you realize, of course, that towns today are spending so much money on education that it is impossible for a town to spend the kind of money to improve a road, particularly when it goes to town and national defense.

Regarding bill 7842, Rep. Avcollie did such a tremendous job, I don't think that I can add much to it. Except to say that I have lived in Naugatuck all my life, 35 years, there isn't one week that doesn't go by, that there isn't an accident on that road. We had a death as recently as one week ago. Sometimes we have two or three deaths a year. I would like to address myself to the aspects of the route as it is the life-line both for industry; to the three major cities in Connecticut, Bridgeport, Waterbury and New Haven. There is all kinds of transportation using this industry and using this road. We have an awful lot of people who use it to get back and forth to work. Goods are being transported over it and I think that it is a very important route that should have been taken care of years ago, and I

mr
19

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Rolatori(continued): am sure that others will address themselves to more important points. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

Mr. Adam Mengacti: Mr. Chairman, I am a former member of the Legislature in 1948, 1950 and 1952. And former Mayor of Naugatuck. The reason that I mentioned those dates is because we have been talking about route 8 for a good many years. I appear in favor of 7842, and it is unfortunate that we have to resort to Legislation to correct a condition that has existed for all these years. In 1957 and 1958, the state highway department undertook a route 8 addition to the town of Naugatuck. And, at that time, in talking to the highway officials, I was assured that they would complete the job. And I say that it is unfortunate that we have to resort to Legislation is because unless we do this, unless we bring it to the attention of the Committee, unless we bring this to the attention of the Highway Department - the job will never be completed. And lives are being lost everyday. And it is a real shame that this area has to suffer and the people involved, and the families that are involved, also have to suffer. And, I believe it should be done and as soon as possible. They had the money allocated, as Mr. Avcollie, just recently talked about, and I say - lets get the job done.

Now, regards to 7839, Naugatuck is at the present time in the process of expending in the excess of nine million dollars for a trunk-sewer and an additon to our sewerage disposal plant. This is all part of this Rubber Avenue complex. And, of course, when we are talking about Rubber Avenue, we are talking about something where it will join onto the Oxford Airport, which is actually the center of our industry. Uniroyal, as has been mentioned, time and time again today, is in the process of building a multi-million dollar office complex. Which is going to employ a good many people. And, God knows we have to do everything possible to encourage industry to grow and to move into the state of Connecticut. I ask for favorable consideration of both bills. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Mondani: Anyone else in favor?

Mr. Paul Bessette: Mr. Chairman, (Thank you very much, I didn't expect to get that from you, but I do thank you); I am the Mayor of Naugatuck and I would like to speak in favor of H. B. 7842 and 7839. I would like to confine my initial remarks to 7842, concerning Rubber Avenue. Two years ago, I sat at a hearing in regards to this bill, and at the time, with much favorable comments, with basically the same arguments you will hear today, with some added. I attended the hearing long enough to hear the state highway department

20
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bessette (continued): rebuttal remarks, and their reasons, and I seem to recall primarily their first reason was the sum of money that was to be allocated in the amount of ten million dollars, was not justified or warranted for this road that connect Naugatuck on through Middlebury and into the town of Oxford. I think that the highway argument was very poor. I think that it did irreparable harm to our section of the state of Connecticut. And, I intend to make some points, explaining my reasons for the feeling that their decision, or rather their counter-argument lent strength to the Transportation Committee in not voting favorably for this sum of money. And, I refer, to of course, during that time the state of Connecticut or prior to this Transportation Hearing that took place two years ago, had issued a statement, a mandate to the borough of Naugatuck, dealing with the water pollution control facility. And the abatement order, that our community and other communities and the 13 Central Naugatuck Complex should clean up the waterways. Well, we cooperated. We initiated action and the public spirited citizens in our respective communities complied with the state request to the tune of 16 million dollars (1). Part of the compliance involved our local industries, the Uniroyal industry as well as other major industries in our town in particular (I'll exclude Waterbury for the moment) but they of course were included in this state mandate and have responded. Now 16 million dollars is a lot of money for small community such as Naugatuck, populated by 23,000 people.

But we feel that to continue on as a thriving community, an industrial complex, that we would respond, hopefully thinking that the state, themselves, and Committees such as this in the state highway, would also respond to our needs. This they have not done. And, so we are going to implore that you take a second look, not only at the mechanic of construction but also of the mechanics of what makes a town thrive and what excites a community. In this case we feel that our local industrial complexes and their 37 million dollar annual payroll is what excites our valley. So that we need things in our town; primarily, we need arteries - not designed to by-pass communities - as the super highways do. But we feel the state highway has to consider the feeder-lines, the arteries. The small trade routes from one community to another, opening up the travel ways that will facilitate traffic and encourage the flow into industrial areas and also into our downtown districts., our shopping areas.

Now, getting back to the interceptor system, I would like to say that the share - the cost of this interceptor system will alleviate problems in our surrounding communities, such as the town of Middlebury, Oxford inventationally, also

21
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bessette(continued): the town of Prospect, a section of the town of Beacon Falls and Bethany. Now, I would like to make specific reference to the fact that six and one half million dollars is going underground, underneath the roadway we would like to have reconstructed. And this is the Rubber Avenue section. The town of Middlebury, incidentally, is also a participant in this state mandate. And they have responded, too. The town of Oxford I am not quite sure of whether or not they received a state mandate, but certainly by the size and scope of the Oxford Airport facility - incidentally initiated to the tune of well over ten million dollars - a facility will readily take jet traffic and is doing it now with some of the smaller planes - in as much as the three communities feel that there is a need for this; I would certainly hope that the Transportation and the Committee would listen to the strength of our arguments and carefully analyze the counter-arguments which will be presented by the State Highway officials.

I would also like to point out that the State Highway officials do not have the answer to all the problems, when they knock out some of these projects. I think that 15 years ago they failed miserably in their planning for the continuity of the spurs off of route 8, in as much as they agreed to the construction of two million dollar bridges, one off of route 68; the second one off of route 8 leading into the borough of Naugatuck. And "dead-ended" these two bridges. And I have tried very hard to see why this was done and I haven't been able to come up with an answer yet. And, I doubt if they have an answer for us. But certainly there must have been some planning - some fore-thought as to where these bridges would eventually go. Now I think that an investment of two million dollars certainly should have carried through. And, I can tell you that both of the bridges; if we were to indicate on the map - and I am sure that the Transportation Committee will do just this when they get a reduced-scale map-- this one is very hard to get definition from and you note this bridges; they are both in the direction of the Oxford facility.

Now our town, in referring back to the irreparable damage that has been caused by lack of follow-through; or lack of appropriating by the Transportation Committee, two years ago - is that our town is going through a moratorium now because one of our major complexes has felt that very possibly that they could not continue on, with their type of industry in the borough of Naugatuck. And we are concerned, we think that initiating action for this feeder-route which will give us about 12 minute access by straight line to the Oxford Airport, will encourage them, in part; we are doing many other things; but, this will encourage them, as they will not have to go the "horseshoe route" from the Oxford facility to the Uniroyal complex in our town.

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bessette(continued): Now I think that salvaging, and if you can imagine what it means, not only to the 23,000 residents of Naugatuck, but also, residents in Waterbury and Ansonia and Derby; and all along the valley, or helping in some manner to salvage the Uniroyal complex - I think is critical. And it should be given special attention to prior to the Transportation Committee, setting aside this project. At this time, I would also make a couple of points regarding bill 7842, this is the construction of route 8 - again, I think I have to openly criticize the actions of the State Highway Engineering and Planning, and all you have to do is to take a look at the map and all of us can wonder why this small stretch was not included or split down the middle in the prior construction that was undertaken and planned well over 15 years ago. Probably the planning goes back 20 years. But 15 years ago the initial construction started and yet we have allowed this 3 inches on your map (I don't know what the scale is - I guess its 5 miles to the inch) well, it is the very worst part of the entire route 8 section from Bridgeport to the Mass. Turnpike.

Now, in criticizing it, I point out that if you have a super-highway deadending into a section of road, going both north and south, certainly, you are going to have arguments. And I don't know where they were with their planning when they failed to recognize this fact that they omitted this one stretch of over-all plan and design. And I think that 15 years - and just allowing this to happen - is ridiculous. Just allowing this stretch to be omitted for 15 years. Recognizing, and they have to accept responsibility for poor planning here. Because if any of them drove the stretch and are aware of the curves and the nature of the road - then they certainly would have included in the portion from Bridgeport into where it deadends in Beacon Falls. And, you have heard Rep. Sarasin's remarks that trucks go through the center of a small community at 68 miles an hour.

My last remarks, are again critical of highway planning, I worked for an engineering firm 16 years ago that did the sub-surface exploration on practically every artery that you see up on the map. And hedge-hopping in planning is very unfair to any district in the state of Connecticut. I think that you should have continuity of planning, which you have not had. And I point out that 15 years ago, we worked on route 8, and then hedge-hopped to route 2 in the town of Glastonbury; back over to route 7; left out a portion of route 8, leading into the main industrial complex; and there was a six year span between the Naugatuck section, that was left uncompleted, and the Waterbury section with the tri-level bridges - it took them six years. We have been waiting for 15 years, with our neighbor Beacon

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bessette(continued): Falls for this small stretch to be completed. By the same token, we have been waiting 15 years, and I go back to the Rubber Avenue artery, 15 years to get continuity of planning on two one million dollar bridges. I certainly hope that this Committee will make themselves fully aware of what our needs are. And speaking about the Rubber Avenue proposal, I would like to emphasize again, that we are talking about the towns of Oxford, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Waterbury and many other communities, as well as Watertown. We think that this spur will greatly relieve some of the congestion, that is going to increase in the years to come in the Waterbury section, it will give us a by-pass from route 8, straight through to the town of Oxford, and hopefully, all these facts you will take into consideration. I'd like to not end my part of comments. I would like to be given an opportunity at rebuttal to state remarks, if this is at all possible.

Chairman Mondani: I'd like to, Mayor, but we don't allow rebuttal.

Mr. Bessette: I recognize that, and, I thank you very much.

Chairman Mondani: Anyone else in favor of these two bills?

Mr. Frederick Hennick: I wear two hats, here today, sir; I am publisher of the Naugatuck Daily News and I am President of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce. I would like to talk in the support of the two bills, and I must admit that the paper that Mr. Avcollie talked about, was put out by our people and I wish that the other Gentlemen were here, because I would like to show them these pictures, are accidents; are fatals; trucks in the rivers; cars in the rivers; these are a series taken in the last 4 to 5 years. The rest of them are down in the morgue. This is what we go through. I have here approximately 50 pictures, but this what we have in Naugatuck on route 8. We have had correspondence; we've had editorials; we've had feature stories; we've had complete cooperation from the Legislature; we go so far - and then we wait - we wait and we wait. We have waited as I said 15 years; and we can't seem to get anywhere. When I was a little boy, this was known as an old road with a beautiful scenery. Well, we can still have the scenery, but I can not see, for the life of me, why the highway department holds onto this road. And, if you ever saw the accidents, or the near accidents, that we have with school buses in Beacon Falls, where they have to try these kids with these trailer truck and with this traffic going back and forth, is just amazing.

I have also, here, if you would like to look at them, correspondence, stories, comments, problems that we have had with various civic groups. There doesn't seem to be a soul that we have come in contact with; Republican, Democrat or

24
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Hennick(continued): Governors; any groups is against doing something about finishing route 8, and yet we can't get it done. I would think, as Mr. Avcollie said; that the Legislature would put this on their conscience; that the State Highway Department would put this on their conscience. Here is a picture that we ran last Friday, here's our latest fatal. That is March 19th. When our telephone rings from the Police Department, and we have an accident, nine out of ten times, they head for the lower part of route 8. Anywhere between Kennedy's Corner and Beacon Falls. I would also like to talk in support of the bill on Rubber Avenue. Naugatuck is probably one of the only communities in the state that leads no-where on its west side. Except for those towns which border the ocean, usually, there is a north and south and east and west access into all communities. But, in Naugatuck, when you go west, you come to practically a dead-end. You not only have the Uniroyal complex, but we also have Risom Manufacturing that does a lot of trucking out Rubber Avenue. I have the President, or now is Chairman of the Board, has said that they spend a lot of time, money and effort, trying to go back and forth from their Danbury plant to their Naugatuck plant and having to take the big "horseshoe turn" out route 63 then onto route 84. If Naugatuck is to grow, it is my humble, persoanl opinion, that the Rubber Avenue must be extended so that we can reach Oxford, reach I-84, and that we can reach the Oxford Airport. Thank you very much.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Anyone else in favor?

Mr. James Greene: Mr. Chaiman; Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber strongly recommends the adoption of H. B. 7839, which is the reconstruction of Rubber Avenue to I84. The Chamber recommends this bill for the following reasons:(1) The Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency has developed a schedule for regional development which has been co-ordinated with the construction of the Oxford Airport. Under this schedule, Naugatuck, Oxford, and Middlebury have been designated for a various types of development. To facilitate the schedule, the present network of roads is not improved, and must be improved significantly. If the it is not, persons employed in this area would not have sufficient access to Naugatuck and routes 8 and 63 and, conversely, people traveling routes 8 and 63 would not have sufficient access to the Oxford-Middlebury area, which both the state of Connecticut and the Federal Government have a substantial monetary interest.

(2) Absence of an improved road system would present extreme hazardous conditions. An increase in traffic is considered dangerous on the existing road network. This is even more true during the winter months. Safety in a new or improved road system would benefit school children on

25
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Greene(continued): entering and leaving school buses. We believe that since the area involved is designated as residential and industrial, traffic would increase tremendously, on this section.

(3) Since I-84 takes a northerly turn and there are no interchanges in Middlebury proper, Naugatuck is, in a sense isolated from I-84. A new or improved road to Middlebury would provide a more satisfactorily westerly road to and from Naugatuck to I-84. This same isolation now concerning Naugatuck exists for the Oxford Airport as well.

(4) A new or improved access highway would also bring the southern area of Middlebury, the northern area of Oxford and the town of Naugatuck together via a state and Federal highway network.

(5) A new or improved access highway would also eliminate the hazardous condition of having all traffic from Naugatuck traveling through the retail section or the main route, which is route 63 and already heavily traveled, and which has schools and churches located thereon.

We support this bill for the reasons presented, and we urge the passage of this particular piece of Legislation.

On H. B. 7842, the Chamber also recommends the adoption of it, which is the improvement of route 8 from route 63 in Naugatuck to Seymour.

(1) The Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce recommends the adoption of this because this section of highway has been the scene of numerous accidents and several fatalities, which have been pointed out earlier by photographs and what not.

(2) This road at present is one of the worst roads in Connecticut as far as safety is concerned.

(3) Because of the safety factor and present congestion, the area's economic future is dampened since future area development is questionable, the reason being, an inadequate and antiquated highway.

We urge your consideration of this bill and passage of it at the same time. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Anyone else in favor? Anyone in opposition?

Mrs. Florence Foley: I am from Naugatuck. The Connecticut Council of Concerned Citizens, Naugatuck Branch, would like to go on record as being opposed to bill 7839. This issue was put to referendum in February of 1970 and again in November of 1970. Both times it was defeated. The people living in the

26
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mrs. Foley (continued): Rubber Avenue (ext.) area are not opposed to the improvement of the road, such as widening, resurfacing, etc., if it remains a commercial zone, only. The rumor in the town of Naugatuck is that it will be changed to an industrial zone, and for this reason we are opposed to this bill, at this time.

Now, we are in favor of bill 7842. The airport access will - the state highway, they mentioned didn't do a report in 1969. Only 700 people from Naugatuck would use this road as opposed to 3,000 from the Waterbury area; 23 from the Seymour-Beacon Falls area; 2200 from the Middlebury area; and so forth. Naugatuck would be the least, to use that access route. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you.

Mr. John Bentley: Department of Transportation, speaking on bill 7839. Rubber Avenue is a town road, the responsibility for reconstructing towns roads does rest with the town having jurisdiction. The Commissioner does not have the authority to spend state funds for reconstruction of this road at this time. We would have to assume, then, that the reason that this bill is being submitted is because of the Oxford Airport from Naugatuck. The 1967 Legislature directed the highway Commissioner to study highway access to the Oxford Airport and submit a report to the 1969 Legislature. That report recommended access be provided by a new road from route 188 easterly to the airport. The preliminary traffic study conducted for use in the report indicated that the estimated traffic demands between the airport and Naugatuck would be low and could not justify the construction of a road easterly to Naugatuck. The reconstruction town roads such as Rubber Avenue, is the responsibility of the town. The 1969 Legislature provided \$700,000 for engineering and rights of way for an access road to Oxford Airport from route 188, and the project is now proceeding in the engineering phase. The estimated cost to reconstruct approximately 2.5 miles of Rubber Avenue would be in excess of one million dollars.

Speaking on H. B. 7842, the department supports the intent of this bill. I have a table written, here, which I will submit for the record, which shows the relative stages of suggested financing. Section 2 of this bill, specifies a construction deadline of December 31, 1975. This is unrealistic because of financial and manpower limitations placed upon the Department. As of January 31, 1971, planning was only 88% completed; this means that there is some what less than five years left in which to complete the remaining activities. Design will take at least three years, including public hearings; right of way activity will take another year to eighteen months and construction, on a project of this magnitude, will take two to three years.

27
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Mr. Bentley(continued): We would like to point out that other sections of route 8 have been completed and opened to traffic during this time. Some of these sections which only handle two lanes of traffic are built - versus the four lanes which is provided in the section which is the subject of this bill. We would also hope that those who support this bill, today, will continue to support it in strength when these sections go before public hearings, in both planning public hearings and the design hearings.

Chairman Mondani: Is route 8 a four lane road?

Mr. Bentley: It is in that section, it is not up to expressway standards. And, what these Gentlemen have said is true, this is a bad situation when you have an expressway on either side that is up to full standards, and you come into a section which does not have a fully controlled access; or does not have the proper width or the geometrics for an expressway. And this is a priority section.

Chairman Mondani: Why would a super highway or expressway at one end and an expressway at the other be built, and leave this particular point out?

Mr. Bentley: Because this did have a four lane operation. It did have the capacity. It lacks the safety features that it should have. But the section through Waterbury was worse, and at the time that was a higher priority section. And, this is what received priority over a section that did have four lane capacity even though it was sub-standard by expressway standards.

Chairman Mondani: But wouldn't this sub-standard rating encourage that being taken care of? I could see it if you stopped the road (maybe you can't answer this) going north or if you stopped the road going south. But, you are running two expressways into a sub-standard - you know, one would be bad but to run one from each end into it, it doesn't seem quite right.

Mr. Bentley: The interchange with 84 had to go ahead on schedule and the 8 expressway had to worked into this. There are limitations put on us in financing an interstate system which require that the interchanges and connecting roads be started within a certain length of time. The congestion in Waterbury was worse than it was in this section now. This section now handles the volume of traffic. Its just the question of it being sub-standard and there is the safety problem. We have met with the town repeatedly. The problems have been brought to the attention of the department and improvements in design and widening and intersection improvements have been undertaken, during the interim.

28
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Chairman Mondani: The congestion implies to me that people are going slow - they could be going at a rapid rate but you know in congestion - they are not killing one another, so to speak. It might be an inconvenience. Let me ask you? In this bill they have a deadline 1975, which is four years. We are talking about five miles of road, right?

Mr. Bentley: It would be 5.8 miles.

Chairman Mondani: It just doesn't seem to me that it would take four years to plan and construct that type of a project.

Mr. Bentley: It does now, sir, because there is a great amount of coordination that is required with individual groups; property owners; town officials; and this is time consuming. We must go to these public hearings. We must consider the comments that are brought out and revise our designs and seek to accommodate as many diverse interests as possible. The terrain, the section through Naugatuck is pretty rugged. There will be rights of ways required and we do anticipate opposition when we go to these public hearings. It just isn't realistic to expect that we can get through the hearings and through the designs and to construction within five years. Also, it is a case of how much manpower can be assigned. We admit that this section is sub-standard, but so do we have other sub-standard sections in other parts of the state, and we couldn't put 100% of our activity and attention on this one section at the expense of everything else. Because we do have other high-accident locations that must be taken care of, simultaneously.

Chairman Mondani: Has a corridor been established? For this?

Mr. Bentley: The basic corridor has been, but the final line has not been selected.

Chairman Mondani: Is there any way that the communities involved can assist you by you giving them what you think is the best line and they schedule hearings or see what objections there are? In other words, the resistance anticipated may not be there and may be able to hold it off so that when it was ready, it could zoom right along.

Mr. Bentley: Even if there was overwhelming acceptance by the majority, we still must go to the hearings and coordinate with all groups, and anyone; even one individual who has a question, we must hear them out and reply.

Chairman Mondani: I am wondering that if sometimes at these hearings, if someone did some ground work before you held it - it would tend to eliminate a great deal of objection. And, it would seem that the number of accidents here would dictate something needs to be done rapidly. The delays here

29
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 23, 1971

Chairman Mondani(continued): are going to be costly in terms of the accidents.

Mr. Bentley: We are very much in favor of this type of coordination. And Mr. Resnikoff and Mr. Vahur in Planning, are more than willing to meet with these people at any time to hear their suggestions and cooperate with them, in anything that can speed up this process.

Chairman Mondani: If this deadline - while I'm not familiar with construction, it may be too short but it just seems with all the pressures, especially in terms of deaths - that there must be a way out of the morass of delays in planning and engineering to speed it up. To have some preliminaries done to get cost estimates; there must be quotas established; some idea where the road will go. And, if this was speeded up, it might be conceivable that it might be done before that, you know. Maybe not, but I am sure that the construction companies right now would be able to give you figures and get that highway done very rapidly.

Mr. Bentley: Well, again its a question of the balance of the program and to what extent this can be given priority.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. The next bill is H. B. 8052 (Rep. Clynes, Rep. DellaVecchia, Sen. Dinielli) AN ACT CONCERNING THE DESIGNATION OF THE TOWN OF SOUTHTON AS A HIGH PRIORITY CITY BY COMMISSIONER OF TRANSPORTATION. Anyone in favor? Anyone opposed?

Mr. Robert Duval: Of the Department of Transportation; the department opposes this bill because The TOPICS (Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety) program was originated to assist a municipality for alleviating traffic congestion and improving traffic safety on local streets. The Federal guidelines required that these be done on a system-wide basis and the improvements be made to maximize the existing roadway. The improvements are undertaken using as a guide an "Areawide TOPICS Study" and a "Primary Type 11 System" map. These are prerequisites to utilizing Federal and State TOPICS funds for construction of improvements.

The Federal guidelines on TOPICS requires the state to give first priority for TOPICS funds to the larger urban areas within a state where congestion is most critical. The 1970 preliminary population of Connecticut towns by the Bureau of Census ranks the municipality of Southington 27th in population with an estimate of 30,687 people. With an area of 36.2 square miles the town is 47th in size. Total mileage, state and town, in the town is 158.83 miles, ranking the town 29th for overall mileage with town maintained mileage at 129.12 miles or 28th of the state's 169 towns.

H-117

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 10
4344-4830**

Thursday, June 3, 1971

144.

MBS

think that reference has been made as far as the consumer is concerned but I'd like to say that I represent the consumer and all the people in the district that I represent and those that are also included, the bankers, who live in my district, which are probably very few. I move that this bill be passed.

RICHARD EDWARDS, 155th District:

Mr. Speaker, if I might, just very briefly, classically when there needs to be an expansion of business, and this has happened, when the federal government has sought to stimulate trade and commerce, it has lowered the interest rate. So I have to reject those comments which were made that talked about cash and carry and destroying the businesses in the state. A lowering of interest rate has always been a stimulation to trade. And the second point, if other states have found that they can live within the 12% or even less, as a credit charge, I'm sure that our state, with its able executives, can do the same. I support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye, opposed. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 14 of the calendar, Calendar No. 1126, Substitute for House Bill No. 7842, An Act Providing a Priority for Con-

Thursday, June 3, 1971

145.

MBS

struction of Route 8 from Naugatuck to Seymour, file 1261.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark?

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has House Amendment "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Clerk please call Amendment "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Avcollie of the 94th:

In line 2 after the word "adding" add the word "to"

In line 3 delete the number "54" and insert in its place the number "9"

In line 5 delete the words "such construction" and after the word "Seymour" add the word "is"

In line 6 after the word "project" add the word "is".

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the language added simply clarifies the bill and its intentions and I move the adoption of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

Thursday, June 3, 1971

146.

MBS

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is basically technical, I will not oppose that but I do intend to oppose the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House "A"? If not, all those in favor of adoption will indicate by saying aye, opposed? The matter is adopted and the Chair rules it technical. Will you remark further on the bill, as amended.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses itself to setting a priority for the construction of Route 8 and, Mr. Speaker, before I start my comments, I would move you, sir, that when the vote is taken on this matter it be taken by roll call.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on a roll call, all those in favor will indicate by saying aye. The Chair will try your minds again on the issue of whether or not there is support for a motion for a roll call. Try your minds agsin. All those in favor of a roll call will indicate by saying aye. In the opinion of the Chair the necessary 20% has supported the motion and roll call will be ordered in the hall of the House.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of this House to listen to what I have to say about Route 8 and about this

Thursday, June 3, 1971

147.

MBS

bill because, in fact, in my opinion, this is a bill that does deal with life and death in every sense, and I think that what I have to say is important not only to the people of my district, not only to people of Rep. Sarasin's district, who co-sponsored this bill, but to the people of the state of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go through some very brief history about this bill which seeks to set a priority on the completion of a stretch of Route 8 which starts in Naugatuck and ends in Seymour. This highway, of course, has been long since completed in every area except for this long stretch between Naugatuck and Seymour and there's an area down outside of Shelton which is well ahead of us as regard to planning and designing and it has already been financed. Mr. Speaker, the stretch of highway that I refer to is well known to any of you that live in our area, that has driven on this highway, it really can't be distinguished or designated as a highway in any sense, it is actually a third class bridal trail, which has been neglected by the state of Connecticut for many years. It started in its planning in the early 1950s and as yet we have not turned over one spade of earth and have not done one concrete thing to accomplish the redesign of this highway. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, Rep. Sarasin and I, together with Gov. Dempsey and this General Assembly provided \$6.1 million for the design engineer and acquisition of land necessary for the completion of this road. During the two

Thursday, June 3, 1971

148.

MBS

years since we acquired or provided for those funds, during those two years, the highway department has done exactly this: they've held a public hearing in Beacon Falls, they've held a public hearing in Naugatuck and they are about to announce what corridor, that is what path, this highway will follow. For this reason, for the reason this highway has been neglected for these many years, for the reason that its been promised with regard to completion dates time and time again and nothing has been done that I seek to mandate a priority. Now, I can tell you, those of you on this side of the aisle, you heard Mr. Collins say he is opposed to the bill, and I can tell you that my very good friend, with whom I've co-sponsored many, many bills, Rep. Sarasin, will take the floor of this House and abandon this bill, for reasons which he'll have to give you. I regret that. I regret that he sees fit to do so because the history of this fight that he and I have had has been an honorable one, as well as a tragic one, with regard to the lives that have been lost. When we came to this General Assembly in January, 1969, we came after the death of a gentleman by the name of William Goodall, age 37 of Beacon Falls, a constituent of Mr. Sarasin's, who was killed the preceding December. While we sat in these halls, on an early January morning, one Anthony Giordano, Jr. of Branford met his death on the same stretch of highway. And while we were petitioning out our bill to provide funds another constituent

Thursday, June 3, 1971

149.

MBS

of Mr. Sarasin's was injured in April and again, a Mrs. Mary Melinda of Waterbury was critically injured and taken to the Waterbury Hospital. Following that in May, five year old Lisa Marie Lessick, again of Beacon Falls was run over, fortunately she did not die. Immediately after we adjourned on June 27, Mr. Robert Powers, an 18 year old boy was hit just leaving a school bus, critically injured but he survived. June 28th, less than two or three weeks after we had left the halls of this House, two people were injured in Beacon Falls, one died, Robert Rissio of Seymour, another constituent of Mr. Sarasin's, In September, Mr. Speaker, a man from New York, driving a truck through Naugatuck was again subjected to the perils of this highway which borders the Naugatuck River, which borders a mountain on one side, he went into the river and died. In the death in September prompted Rep. Sarasin to write the then Governor Dempsey and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was proud of Mr. Sarasin's actions in that case, although it was our Democratic Governor he was addressing himself to and the headlines said, "Time to quit playing games with lives on Route 8, Rep. Sarasin tells Dempsey." And I think Ron put the case for Route 8 so well in his letter that I'd like to read part of it to you in support of the case that I put to you today for priority.

"Route 8", and these are Mr. Sarasin's words, "is a necessary, vital traffic artery which aids the economic health

Thursday, June 3, 1971

150.

MBS

of this portion of Connecticut. Unfortunately, as I pointed out before the Committee on Roads and Bridges and on the floor of the House of Representatives, the problems caused by Route 8 between Seymour and Naugatuck become greater with every improvement which is made elsewhere on Route 8. We have attempted to reach meaningful, if only temporary, solutions to this problem. We have met with highway department officials, there solution was the installation of 45 reflectors on fence posts along the roads. This bad section of road, in the middle of a superhighway is killing people. This is one section of road where the state can't pass the buck to the driver or the elements. The highway department public relations people are embarrassed by the poor press this monstrosity called a highway is receiving. But that is little consolation to the dead and the injured." Continuing, Rep. Sarasin said, "We are tired of being the poor relative on this road. As an example hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent landscaping Route 8 in other areas, while this portion of the highway has a few trees and shrubs left standing after the 1955 flood and they have been depleted as a result of being struck by motor vehicles. This portion of so-called highway is killing and maiming too many people to be ignored. Fifty percent of all accidents investigated in the town of Beacon Falls occur on this road. It's time to quit playing games with people's lives." To quote the

Thursday, June 3, 1971

151.

MBS

editorial, "It's a little too soon to point with pride." So said Rep. Ronald Sarasin in 1969, September, and immediately thereafter, before Christmas, we lost number five, Mrs. Wargo of Beacon Falls, age 77, hit crossing the street while coming home from church. Mr. Speaker, and members of this House, I quote Rep. Sarasin because indeed I am dismayed because he is not with me on this bill but also because I am indeed proud of the fact that he supported me all this time. The words he said to Governor Dempsey rung true in 1969 and I say to you that they ring true now with regard to Governor Meskill, who is responsible for the withdrawal of any Republican support on the other side of the aisle, or so I am told. And I would say to all of you on the other side of the aisle, this is not a partisan issue, this is not a Naugatuck bill, this is a Connecticut bill. People from Waterbury have been killed and people from Seymour have been killed, people from Branford have been killed and it could be from your town next. I say to those few of you that are left on the other side of the aisle, I remember in 1967 session when the honorable representative Lenge used to stand, at least on a daily occasion and say to us on the other side of the aisle, now is the time, come join us on a non-partisan issue, now's the time for you Democrats to cast a vote with the Republicans. With all due respect to Mr. Collins, and all due respect to Mr. Sarasin, with all due respect to any of the leaders who attempt to

MBS

stand and take me on on this priority issue, I say to you Republicans, now is the time to show what you have. I need a vote to pass this bill and I don't particularly care of the Governor vetos it because if the Governor vetos this then the next two, three, four, five tragic deaths are on his shoulders, not mine.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, any time that any member of this House gets up and attempts to blame the Governor of this state, for a highway fatality, I consider it to be not germane, highly out of order, and a complete and total lack of courtesy. We've listened to Mr. Avcollie go on and on, I think bordering sometime on a total lack of courtesy and I think he ought to be warned and ruled out of order, sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman does not have the floor, the Chair has recognized the gentleman from the 165th, he has stated a point of order and some suggestions to that point of order that the Chair would pass on to the gentleman from the 94th.

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, I meant no disrespect to the Governor and I'm afraid Mr. Collins misinterpreted what I said, I said, and I believe that there was no objection when I read into the record what the good Rep. Sarasin told our Gov. Dempsey, but perhaps it was a different story then. I simply said

Thursday, June 3, 1971

153.

MBS

that if this measure is vetoed then so be it that it's up to the Governor. I didn't indicate that he would, I can't indicate that he will. I suppose Rep. Collins can. I mean no disrespect to anyone on this argument. All I want is to see the highway department move. Now there will be arguments that this is a bad precedent, that we should not mandate the transportation commission to do anything and I would say to you that there are no sacred cows over there, I've heard that expression several times on this floor from both sides of the aisle and I would say to you that it is our duty to mandate where they are not doing the job. Rep. Sarasin and I have been across the street, we've been given a schedule which includes in entering into the design stage by next year, two year design stage and one year acquisition stage, it means construction starting in 1975, completion of construction in 1977. This bill calls for completion one year earlier, we were both told by Commissioner Shugrue, at our meeting across the street, that, in fact, we could expedite this plan or this program. It would take spending some more money, yes, I'll meet that attack before its made. It would take overtime, it would mean that instead of waiting for the leaves to fall off the trees in the fall, so they can take an aerial survey, they can get a few people out with some surveying equipment to do the surveying now, it would mean they might have to pay a designing agency a little more money to close the design

Thursday, June 3, 1971

154.

MBS

within eight months or a year instead of two years. But I'd point out to you that construction costs on highways are rising 10% every year and have risen 10% for the last three years and if we spend a little bit more money to expedite this plan we are saving money in the long run. We've already wasted \$6 million during the period that Rep. Sarasin and I have been here just in increased construction costs. I further point out to you that we do have \$6.1 million already authorized in the last session. We are not asking for any more money and this money will take care of getting us through the design stage and into the construction stage. We've had a lot of promises, Rep. Sarasin has been promised by Mr. Wood, who doesn't communicate with me, he sends his letters to Mr. Sarasin, but Mr. Sarasin has been kind enough to let me read them and he's indicated that he realizes there is a sense of urgency and he will, in fact, attempt to meet the schedule which I have just set forth. But we've heard promises before. I could read you a lot of the clippings show you any of the fifty pictures I have here of accidents, there's some statements in here by Rep. Sarasin and First Selectman Green wherein we asked in 1969 what happened to the grand plans that were set forth by Commissioner Ives in '61 and the answer was that other projects took precedence and yours took a back seat. Well, I have no small degree of confidence in our Governor or in the people seated here, but I must say that I do have some

Thursday, June 3, 1971

155.

MBS

doubt about the authenticity of the bureaucratic schedules that have been put forth with the exception of Mr. Wood, most of the people across the street at the Transportation Commission seems to be the same ones, the same ones I met with when Commissioner Conklin was there and Commissioner Ives was there and they don't have any sense of urgency. Now, we are losing an average of two to three lives a year on this highway. We just lost one two months ago in Naugatuck and we will lose another probably before we come back here, another two before we come back here next January. And I would say to you that this request is not an outlandish one, it is an unusual one. We don't usually mandate a commissioner, we usually let them sit on there plush chairs and do as they please. But I am speaking to you on behalf of all the people in this state that might be killed on this highway and I'm saying to all of you on the other side of the aisle, come, join us, Nero fiddled while Rome burned and we diddle while people die on Route 8 or we can post this mandate, do something different, tell the Transportation Commission when we want this highway finished and then we can all rest easier when we go to sleep at night. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RONALD SARASIN, 95th District:

Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit surprised at some of the comments by Rep. Avcollie who, indeed, has sponsored or I have sponsored with him a great number of items of legislation

MBS

effecting our joint districts and the town of Naugatuck and my three town district. I'm surprised at some of the remarks of Rep. Avcollie because he is anticipating something that apparently hasn't as yet happened. He's accused me of abandoning a bill that we have introduced. As I recall the order of speaking there has only been one prior speaker to me and that was Rep. Avcollie. I haven't said anything on the floor of this House to justify his accusation that I am ready to abandon a bill that we have introduced. I would point out to the members of this House, those that are still in attendance, that indeed everything that Rep. Avcollie has said about this highway is, in fact, true and perhaps understated. Route 8 from Naugatuck to Seymour is an atrocity. It is a situation that I wrote to Gov. Dempsey and said that it is time to quit playing games and time to move this road along. It is a situation and I'm still disturbed about it and I am still trying to get something done about it. We have had, both Rep. Avcollie and I, have had assurances from the Department of Transportation, that indeed this road has been finally taken out of a bottom file drawer someplace where it has been lying fallow and brought out and somebody is finally looking at it and somebody is finally going to be doing something and they are giving us a schedule on it. I'm quite pleased with that fact. That we do, now, have a schedule, something that we can look at. Something that we can go back and say, as soon

Thursday, June 3, 1971

157.

MBS

as they miss one of the deadlines that you promised us and you've not lived up to your promise and I have some assurance of that because it is more than we have every gotten out of the Department of Transportation before in the years that Rep. Avcollie's been fighting for this road and in a session, prior to this one, that I've been fighting for this road. It is indeed an atrocity, it's something that has to be corrected. As the gentleman from Naugatuck has said that this road and our situation are difficulties that are merely compounded, as a result of improvements in other highways, especially improvements of Route 8 in other areas. At the present time, Route 8 travels from Winsted to Shelton, in most areas it is a limited access highway with the exception of 4 or 5 or 6 miles between Naugatuck and Seymour which really is through the heart of this town of Beacon Falls, where it suddenly becomes an unlimited access highway and it is hazardous, people are dying on this road and it is something that has to be corrected immediately. I am upset about some of the remarks that Rep. Avcollie made in regard to my position on this bill. I don't think he can say any more than I could say that Rep. Avcollie is not concerned about this road. He is and I am. And so are people in the communities that we represent. I think it should be clear and perhaps I should make this point now, before I go any further that I do, in fact, support this bill, that I would like to see it accomplished in the manner

Thursday, June 3, 1971 158.

MBS

in which it is before the House, as amended by Rep. Avcollie, that I think that there very well be a problem, and perhaps a bad precedence established when we mandate on this floor. But a highway must be completed at a certain time. I can be pleased and satisfied with assurances by the department involved and by the Governor that, in fact, somebody is looking at our problem and somebody is trying to do something about it for the first time, since I have been involved and interested in this. But I do support this bill and I resent greatly the fact that Rep. Avcollie has taken this position on this floor that, in fact, I am going to abandon the bill when I hadn't even risen to speak on it. All of the items explained by Rep. Avcollie, as far as the hazards, the deaths, the difficulties, the lack of safety, the lack of attention to this highway are absolutely true and as I said earlier, completely understated. It is worse than that. You've got to live there to believe it. And you have to travel the road. The interesting thing about our situation is that those of us who do live there are usually not the ones who become the victims of the accidents. It's the people who come down from Winsted at 60 to 70 miles an hour, because that's the allowable speed and suddenly run into a very hazardous, curving narrow, 2-lane road, which is Route 8 south through the Naugatuck State Forest, which was never a road that was designed, it was simply a road that grew, and in fact in the

Thursday, June 3, 1971

159.

MBS

early days of the communities it was called the dug road because it was dug out of the bank of the river and it hasn't changed one iota since then. We have, unfortunately, killed a lot of people. When you live in a town as I do in Beacon Falls and Route 8 is your main street with 15,000 cars a day, it is a little bit tough because the people who are traveling through this community are not aware even though the speed limit signs are quite large and they are blinking lights and other things we've been able to obtain to draw the attention to the fact that this is a hazardous area, they are not aware of the fact that they are no longer on limited access Route 8. And this is where we lose people and have accidents. Including the last one that Rep. Avcollie mentioned, the 77 year old lady coming home from church who didn't manage to get across Route 8 in time and was killed on that highway. I fully support anything that this body, that the so-called bureaucratic agencies, that the Governor of the State of Connecticut, can do to solve our problem and it is a problem that has been overlooked for too many years. This road has been 25 years in the making and other roads that weren't even thought of are now completed and in the process of being redesigned. I fully support this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GEORGE HANNON, 16th District:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know where Route 8 is I'm not even sure I know where Naugatuck and Beacon Falls are but I should

Thursday, June 3, 1971 160.

MBS

like to address myself to the bill and in doing so the general theme of the legislation, I would most respectfully correct my good friend and colleague from the 95th when he said this is a bad precedent to come here with a sense of urgency that this bill and others have preceded it have come before us. I frankly think it is refreshing and I would remain reminding you that a few weeks ago Rep. Dooley introduced what was one of the first of the refreshing measures to bring to your attention the urgency of completing Interstate 84 in eastern Connecticut. Shortly thereafter you reacted to this sense of urgency by voting in favor of that measure and shortly thereafter on two occasions, on different days, two please from East Hartford were brought to you on a sense of urgency and in your wisdom you voted for those. And very shortly you will receive from the chamber upstairs, a bill which affects West Hartford and Farmington and Bloomfield, outlining a sense of urgency there. I would only say that while I have the microphone that I wish that there was some concurrence in the sense of urgency because the chamber upstairs seems to do a side-step when it doesn't affect their particular town. I would hope that those in the Senate who didn't live in the Route 8 area would be just as compassionate and just as concerned about the lives and future of the people in that area as they were when they passed 291 a few days ago. I subscribe to this type of legislation. I think it is refreshing for those of us

Thursday, June 3, 1971 161.

MBS.

who have been elected to address ourselves to these individual matters and not leave it up to the executive branch of government to grind it out according to the timetable. I would hope that we would have more of this type of legislation in future years.

GENNARO FRATE, 150th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. What the gentleman from Naugatuck is asking this House to do is to forget every other highway in the state of Connecticut and give a number one priority to this piece of road which is 6 miles long in Naugatuck and Beacon Falls. Along with it, he has a date on it, telling the Highway Department that you must complete this road by December 31, 1976. I've been in this House a long time, and I don't know why the House of Representatives is qualified to tell the Highway Department how to build a road, when to build it and furthermore, I want to call your attention that there's no money on this bill, no money at all, I don't know where they are going to get the money to build it with. This project is a 6 mile stretch of road, it is already four lanes, it isn't as if you travel a 2-lane road, we have roads in the state of Connecticut like Route 70 that carries a lot more traffic, than this particular stretch of road in 6 miles, and that's only 2 lanes, this is four lanes. Now, this project, the total cost given to me by the Department of Transportation and its estimated cost is \$26, 500,000.

Thursday, June 3, 1971

162.

MBS

authorized so far, as the gentleman said, is \$6.1 million. What you are going to need to complete road is \$20,400,000. The bill calls for no money. The Highway Department does have a schedule to build this road as of January 31, 1971 planning was only 88% completed. This means that there is somewhat less than five years left in which to complete the remaining activities. Design will take at least three years, including public hearings, rights of way, activity will take another year or 18 months and construction on the project of this magnitude will probably take two to three years and here's a gentleman here calling for a piece of road that he doesn't have the money for, he's got a date on it telling the highway department to forget everything else in the state of Connecticut, forget all the rest of the roads, and take care of this section in Naugatuck.

ALBERT PROVENZANO, 127th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill for several reasons. First, in our area the people use Route 8 going north and for that alone I urge that we support this measure. But more than that I think it is about time that this House let the different departments know that we are watching them because I'm sure that many of us know and have seen measures pass this house, '65 and '67 and '69 and have seen no results come from those passages of bills. In '67 I'm going to relate to you from what's happened in our town, in '67 we appropriated

Thursday, June 3, 1971

163.

MBS

in this House money for an improvement and for the past four years I have seen nothing but highway men with red flags on that road....

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to curtail debate on this important subject but I do think that the gentleman is citing examples of problems, on matters unrelated to this bill, that they are not germane and I think the remarks should be restricted to the bill in front of us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman's point is well taken. Will the gentleman from the 127th restrict his remarks to the issue before us, the bill.

ALBERT PROVENZANO, 127th District:

Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to be germane because other speakers have pointed to this body that we should not tell the Department of Transportation, particularly, and other departments how to run their department and what time tables they should follow. I am saying that we should when work is not accomplished as we should like to see it done. After all, we do provide the money, we do provide the taxes from our constituents, and if we feel that the work isn't done as we would like to see it done, I think it is time for us to let those department heads know about it. And that is being germane to this subject. And that is my argument. I think it is

Thursday, June 3, 1971 164

MBS

about time we let those department heads, and particularly the Department of Transportation know that we are not satisfied with the way they are acting and not satisfied with the results and I, as one legislator, am not satisfied and I want to make my remarks known.

EARL HOLDSWORTH, 125th District:

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this piece of road is a rather windy piece of road but I am just wondering if the problems that are encountered there many of them are not a police problem. I've traveled over this road many, many times as a matter of fact for several years before it was a 4-lane road, I traveled over that section of road. I'd like to point out to the members of this Assembly that Route 8 runs all the way from Bridgeport up to Winsted and not as one of the previous speakers mentioned stopped at Shelton or Derby. The section from Shelton to Bridgeport is a 2-lane section of road. We have a problem with the heaviest traffic on that section of road of any part of Route 8 and here we are down on the lower end of the deal having a higher percentage of traffic. In Fairfield County I'd like to point out that in Fairfield County we don't have a 4-lane highway running north and south. We have a 2-lane highway in Route 7....

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, point of order. I don't really think that a highway that doesn't exist in this gentleman's district is

Thursday, June 3, 1971 165.

MBS

germain and Mr. Provenzano's remarks weren't germain.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your point is well taken.

EARL HOLDSWORTH, 125th District:

Mr. Speaker, aren't we talking about the priority of this particular road?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think if there's any discussion of priority it should be one on the road in points.

EARL HOLDSWORTH, 125th District:

All right. I don't see why this particular section of road where there are 4-lanes, 4 travel lanes, should have a priority over sections of road which only have two lanes and have to carry as much traffic, or more.

JOHN MAIOCCO, 133rd District:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to support this bill, I come from an area which is close by to Mr. Holdsworth's area, and I do agree that we need some work down there on Route 8, we'd like to get that end of Route 8 finished so that we can have a nice road all the way up to Waterbury and up to Winsted. However, I had the good fortune to take Mr. Mastrianni home last night, he lives in Derby and I had the misfortune of driving through this particular nightmare alley. It's not the first time I've driven through it but I hope it is the last time at least in the state that it is in. It seems to me that

MBS

the convenience would be served if we fixed Route 8 between Shelton and Bridgeport but certainly the safety of the public would be better served at this time if we were to fix that portion of Route 8 which is known as nightmare alley. If I weigh the convenience as against the safety I have to stick with the safety. I would support this bill.

NICHOLAS PANUZIO, 134th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the bill, not because of the problem that exists, I well recognize it, I've driven the road. I'm amazed by the problem that seems to be happening with the Highway Department and I had the opposite problem, I had a hard time stopping them from building a highway and I think the problem that will arise if we pass this type of legislation, that next year if I have a continuing problem, I might be in with a bill to prevent them from building it by such and such a date. I think that could go on and on on both sides, by a lot of legislators, I think it could create real havoc with many of our departments. So, why I can recognize the problem and sympathize with it, I hope some people would recognize the problem that would exist on the other side and those people who are trying to prevent highways going through, particularly environmentalists who might get involved and see the types of problems chaos that we can create in this legislature if we start passing bills of this nature.

Thursday, June 3, 1971 167.

MBS

BERNARD AVCOLLIE, 94th District:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly and to clarify one or two points, and for the second time. First of all, I am sorry I offended Rep. Sarasin in trying to second-guess him on the basis of conversations I had with him prior thereto and I am just extremely delighted to have him back in the fold if he was ever out of it and therefore, I want to tell Mr. Frate that the next time he speaks would you not say the gentleman from the 94th but say the gentlemen from the 94th and the 95th because we are both on this bill. And we haven't indicated to you or anyone else that we want you to forget every other highway in the state. We've asked for priority one designation and many, many highways in this state have that designation. We haven't asked you to put aside any other work. We haven't asked you to do something without money because we fought like tigers two years and got \$6.1 million. We do have money, we won't need any more money this session at all. There's plenty of money to do what we are asking, so this business about there being no money is just fallacious. With regard to the \$20 million necessary to complete the road, yes, you are right, right now \$20 million is necessary, next year it will be \$22 million, the following year it will be \$24 million because the costs are rising 10% every year and so by expediting this by one year, Mr. Sarasin and I are, indeed, saving the state approximately \$3 million by getting them

Thursday, June 3, 1971

168.

MBS

going when they should be going. With regard as to whether or not we are qualified to tell the highway department, and whether or not we're setting a precedent which is going to react like topsy and cause everyone else to come in with setting priorities, I'd say yes, we are qualified. When we live there and we see the people dying, when we see a highway that has been left in the middle of a road which does extend from Bridgeport to Winsted remain in the condition it is, when we've had promises since 1953, '54, '57, '59, '61, '63 and again in '69, yes, we're qualified, Mr. Frate, we're well qualified. We certainly are qualified to know when promises have been broken and what we are trying to do by this bill is indicate to the Transportation Department that we've had it right up to here with promises, we don't want any more. We are going to mandate a completion date. With regard to the question as to whether or not this is a police problem, apparently you haven't been on the road lately, it is not a police problem. Any intelligent policeman in the area stays off the highway, it's too dangerous and there's not enough room for all those cars anyway. With regard to the stretch from Shelton to Bridgeport that stretch is already funded, it's got a higher priority than this stretch and it's well ahead of it and it will be completed without a mandate before this section will be. So that, therefore, Route 8 from Naugatuck to Seymour is mandated and if completed in the course of the

Thursday, June 3, 1971 169.

MBS

schedule mandated in this bill will be the last six miles, six miles of road as Mr. Frate said. I think it is an extraordinary problem. We wouldn't come to you to mandate the completion of a road if not for the fact that we have completely run out of patience. My friend, Mr. Sarasin said it has never been scheduled before but it really has. It was scheduled March 8, 1969 when First Selectman Green and Rep. Sarasin were given a schedule then and that schedule has already slipped. It is an extraordinary problem, we are losing two to three lives a year and I plead with you, I urge you to vote for this bill, to vote for it so that we can finally see this road finished and so that you finally can be done with hearing from Rep. Sarasin and I every two years. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is going to announce an immediate roll call. Will you remark further on the bill?

GERARD SPIEGEL, 126th District:

Mr. Speaking, speaking briefly I'd like to say that the gentleman from the 94th with his story has touched the bottom of my heart and I've gone through this problem myself in Trumbull and the reason I don't believe the gentlemen...that the gentlemen in this House who haven't gone through the same situation, I don't think we can hold ourselves up as experts and I think it is a bad bill and a bad precedent and I hope it is defeated.

Thursday, June 3, 1971 170.

MBS

IRVING STOLBERG, 112th District:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can't hold ourselves up as experts but we also can't hold up the Department of Transportation in case, after case, after case as experts. I think the casualty list testifies for the need here, either we meet the need or we don't. I support the bill.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, as I have in the past few weeks, I rise in opposition to bills of this nature which attempt to mandate to the Department of Transportation, not only construction deadlines but for the first time changes in priorities. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely dangerous precedent, one recognized by the gentleman from the 94th who indicated that it was unusual or unique procedure rather than something unprecedented. I submit, Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of Rep. Sarasin, I know I've discussed this problem with him over the last two weeks time again, I'm not so sure that I can express the concern of Rep. Avcollie who seems to be more concerned about getting newsprint and coverage back home rather than the serious question we have throughout this state of priorities, motor vehicle accidents and deaths on highways, not only on Route 8 but on Route 7, Route 84, I-91 and almost every other major thoroughfare throughout this state. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous concept, if we here are to take the power to establish priorities and

Thursday, June 3, 1971 171.

MBS

construction deadlines out of the hands of the Department of Transportation I submit to you we should do the road work in this state and abolish the department. We might get more confused than we are now under that kind of approach. The gentleman from Stratford indicated time and time again he's had problems with the highway department. I think we all have. But I think one of the reasons is that it is our own fault, Mr. Speaker. We continually in this General Assembly attempt to bring goodies back home to our local areas and attempt to push very hard for road funds, funds which are not appropriated for several years after, we bring false hopes to the people in our areas who think if a bond authorization is given in one session, that somehow, by magic, that in the next few years a highway will appear. We have put our highway department, over the years, in the almost impossible position of scheduling construction years and years in advance. Unable to keep up with the free spending capabilities of the members of this Assembly in attempting to put funds through without the capabilities in the department of making that particular project come to realization within a reasonable period of time. It's unfortunate that Rep. Avcollie has not over the last few years, last several years, been able to obtain more cooperation out of the department or the commissioner, at that time. I'm sure then he has had, or Rep. Sarasin has had, more cooperation in the last four months. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, the

Thursday, June 3, 1971

172.

MBS

concerns of the people in this area do not go unnoticed. The highway fatalities are a problem throughout the entire state. This is not the way to resolve that problem. This is a bad bill, it's a bad precedent, it does not do justice to the Department of Transportation to have this legislature attempt to set priorities on each construction project. I will continue to oppose bills like this, Mr. Speaker, and I think it should be resoundly defeated.

MR. SPEAKER:

For the benefit of the members who have just returned to the chamber, we are on Route 8 somewhere between Naugatuck and Seymout, the Chair would observe that the stretch of road is some six miles long and getting longer by the minute. Will you remark further on the bill.

GEORGE HANNON, 16th District:

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the second time, sir, and addressing my remarks to, in particular, Mr. Collins, but in general to those on the other side of the aisle, I would grade him A for his consistency. He opposed Interstate 86, he opposed today Route 8 and I suspect when I-291 comes down here he will oppose it. It's regrettable, however, that the gentleman who sits in the front office, on the second floor, didn't take the same posture on I-84, when it was introduced it passed this House over the human cry of Mr. Collins and his colleagues. And when it went to the Senate, it passed

Thursday, June 3, 1971

173

MBS

the Senate over the human cries of Sen. Ives and his colleagues. And in his imminent wisdom the gentleman from the front office signed the bill into law.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker....

GEORGE HANNON, 16th District:

Mine, too, Mr. Speaker.

FRANCIS COLLINS, 165th District:

I thought so. You ain't kiddin', George.

CARL R. AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, my turn, sir. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I missed the early part of this debate because Route 8, of course, runs through my town and to get anywhere from there until they fix Route 8 is becoming more and more difficult as the volume of traffic increases. One's reminded of the old story about reaching a certain town and the fellow who says you can't get there from here you have to go someplace else and start over. We can't down Route 8 and we can't North on Route 8. But that's not the important point and there's not an important political point involved, what is involved and what is important is the difficulty of simply driving over this stretch of road, and I'm not talking about speeding, and I'm not talking about being drunk or reckless or any of other bad things that drivers can do, but just driving on it, particularly if it is wet or foggy. It's born out by the fact

Thursday, June 3, 1971 174.

MBS

that there's hardly a week that goes by that somebody doesn't go off this highway and down the bank and into the river or worse. It's probably the single most dangerous stretch of 4-lane road in the entire state of Connecticut and the continual avoidance of its improvement and completion, even though the funds have been appropriated a long time ago, is criminal, in my opinion and what is this General Assembly for but to mandate programs that nobody who was responsible for doing them seems to want to do. I think that this is a need that cries out to be answered and I think that we should pass this bill and indicate to them that they've got to put a stop to this before there is more serious damage done for the populace than has been done so far.

GERALD STEVENS, 122nd District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise surprisingly, I'm sure, in opposition to this bill. But in so doing I'd just like to point out that it appears that we are witnessing what's known as a flip-flop which is a reference that is usually made for budget debates and directed by my good friend from Ansonia towards those of us on this side. The reason that I refer to this debate on Route 8 as a flip-flop is that I don't recall in the past two sessions of the General Assembly any bill like this that would mandate any part of the executive branch to do anything. And, apparently, according to Mr. Avcollie, they weren't doing anything especially in the highway department since 1954.

Thursday, June 3, 1971

175.

MBS

So I think that what is before us now is obviously a political attempt to try and embarrass someone. I suspect that you will get the results even without the bill because the current administration is concerned with Route 8, it has to be taken care of, it will be. I don't think there will be a need for a bill like this in subsequent sessions and it is just unfortunate that the concern that's been showed by the majority party today was lacking in previous sessions when they had the commissioner. It is a bad bill and it should be defeated.

ROBERT OLIVER, 104th District:

Mr. Speaker, as one from New Haven who has shared, perhaps, a bi-partisan or non-partisan frustration with the highway department over the years, when a colleague of mine wants a road, he needs a road, and the highway department does not cooperate with him, then I'm going to stand with him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the members please take their seat, will the staff please clear the floor and the aisle area. Will the members please take their seats. The machine will be opened. Have all the members voted? Is your vote properly recorded? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will take a tally

ASTRID HANZALEK, 40th District:

Mr. Speaker...I'm very sorry but I have a peripatetic voting button and it again did not register and I want to be registered as voting in the negative.

Thursday, June 3, 1971 176.

MBS

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm sorry the Chair wasn't able to hear the lady's comments.

ASTRID HANZALEK, 40th District:

I did say I had a peripatetic button.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the Chair inquire where?

ASTRID HANZALEK, 40th District:

The Chair may inquire and he may not get an answer though.

MR. SPEAKER:

Fair enough.

ASTRID HANZALEK, 40th District:

I wish to be recorded as voting in the negative.

MR. SPEAKER:

The lady would care to be recorded as voting in the negative and the Clerk will please so note.

THE CLERK:

Total number voting		147
Necessary for passage		74
Those voting Yea	79	
Those voting Nay	68	
Absent and not voting	30	

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill is passed.

THE SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

CARL AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'd like to move for suspension

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

SENATOR JACKSON IN THE CHAIR

June 8, 1971

52.

ment. I think that I should point out that after our discussion last night on a number of the bills before us. I pointed out that CMS was opposed to this. To those bills. I would like to point out that they are not opposed to this. They feel that it would be a part of the services and the contracts once this is established something that they could offer to their subscribers. Add to their existing contracts as an additional service. And I think that the experience in other states where this vision service has been incorporated has been excellent. It has been well received. There have been no problems with it. I would point out as a part of the legislative intent of this bill that it is expected that the Commissioner would have, the Commissioner of Insurance would have a review powers in the review of the contracts that are offered for sale. Whether they be group or individual. That he will have the last word in point out what should be in the contract. And I offer this as an objection that came up in the last few hours. And I think that this is well written into the bill. But in the event it is misinterpreted, I would like to offer this as part of my statement. So I move for adoption of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. AYE. Nay? The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 5, please Cal. 217, File 1261, Favorable report joint standing committee on Transportation on Substitute H.B. 7842 An Act Providing a Priority for Construction of Route 8 from Naugatuck to Seymour.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

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

June 8, 1971

53.

house. There is a House amendment, Sch. A. And I would request that rather than have the Clerk read the amendment. I could point out in file 1261 what the amendment does. In line 2 after the word adding at the very end of the sentence. Add the word to. In line 3 rather than sub-division 54, comes 9 which is compatible with Statutes. In line 5 they delete the word such construction and add the word is. And In line 6, after the word project add the word is. Make it read gramatically.

Mr. President, two weeks ago we made a decision in this body where we dictated the path of a road in West Hartford. There was some objection to that, at that time. Saying that we were interfering or entering into the prerogatives of the Commission on Transportation. At that time I noted that perhaps the Legislative branch should do more than merely appropriate funds. But when they saw a void fill it. This act does not repeal a bill. Or repeal a road. It does not delay a road. In fact it has an opposite effect. It states that Route 8 from Naugatuck to Seymour be identified as the number one highway project by the Commissioner of Transportation. And that such road will be completed by October 1976. Many in this circle might ask why such an act. The reason is very simply. That if one were to look at Route 8, they would see in the North a regular four lane expressway. And in the south four lane expressway. And in between this, the two expressways end and the road merges into an old fashioned inadequate. What I would almost term as secondary road. And the high speed traffic is funneled into this. As a result there have been numerous accidents. People have lost their lives. And we are directing the Commissioner of Transportation to complete a project which started back in 1953. It was funded in '69 with additional money. And if we delay, ladies and gentlemen of the circle. We will need additional money to complete a road to prevent future accidents, and deaths. All of us had on our desk a copy of the Naugatuck Daily News which had an article spectacular crash kills Waterbury pair. Again on Route 8. Again on that un-

June 8, 1971

54.

finished portion. If we do not act. If we do not dictate as a Legislative body, this road may not be completed. And will go on year after year after year. We must act. And we must as a legislative body take the initiative. On this road this year and establish our priorities. And we must state as a legislative body the group who has appropriated the money. We must state that this road must be completed by x date. Its imperative. Some of you who may object, may say again that we are taking the prerogatives of the Department. But we've done that on design. I would hope we would do this on priority. And I would hope in future sessions. We will do it on need if passed road programs.

I would like Mr. President to yield to Senator Buckley on this very important bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Thank you Senator Mondani. Mr. President, members of the circle. It is with real regret that I rise to have to support this bill. This roadway has been in the planning stage. The reconstruction of this section of the roadway since the mid 50's. Here we are almost 20 years later and this section which ties together completed segments of Route 8, north from Waterbury, north to the Massachusetts line is completed. From Seymour in the south end of this segment down to almost Bridgeport is completed. Or will be completed very shortly. This section of Route 8 has rightfully claimed the title of Blood Alley. Since 1968, eleven people have been killed on this section of highway. Senator Mondani referred to the crash which occurred last week-end. In which two more people met their lives. Two other people were seriously injured and are in the hospital. If I stated and I am being consistent in supporting this bill. Because when the widening of inter-state 84 came to this chamber some weeks ago. I stated that I felt it was the Legislature's right and duty and truly it prerogative to set priorities. This should be number one

June 8, 1971

55.

priority. There is no section of road, especially connecting two segments of super highway which is more in need of immediate construction in the state known to me.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 6, please top of the page Cal. No. 1226, File No.1073 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary on Substitute H.B. 8914 An Act Concerning Felony for Non-Addict Drug Pushers.

THE CHAIR:

May that be passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has received from the House, under Disagreeing Action, Favorable report joint standing committee on Government Administration and Policy, Substitute S.B. 1212 An Act Concerning the Establishment of a State Athletic Commission.

THE CHAIR:

Table for the Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Senator Pauliso.

SENATOR FAULISO:

I move for suspension of the rules for consideration of the particular bill that was just read in, and tabled for the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

There has been a motion for suspension of the rules to take up this matter immediately. Would you comment?

SENATOR FAULISO:

No comments, Mr. President, I just move for suspension at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hammer.