

HB 5147

PA 744

1971

Transportation 273, 278-279, 298 4

House 5066 1

Senate 3402 1

6

**H-118**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 11  
4831-5162**

Saturday, June 5, 1971

11

Page 16, calendar 1169, house Bill 7903, file 1284.

Calendar 1170, substitute for House Bill 7959, file 1292.

Calendar 1171, substitute for House Bill 8228, file 1294.

Page 17, Calendar 1217, substitute for House Bill 7686,  
file 1349.

Page 18, Calendar 1234, House Bill 6837, file 1353.

Calendar 1242, substitute for House Bill 6448, file 1377.

Calendar 1245, Substitute for House Bill 7974, file 1382.

Page 19, Calendar 1263, substitute for House Bill 5561,  
file 1431.

Calendar 1273, substitute for House Bill 5247, file 1429.

Calendar 1274, substitute for House Bill 6512, file 1428.

Page 20, Calendar 1299, House Bill 5147, file 1437.

Page 21, Calendar 1308, substitute for House Bill 5895,  
file 1463.

Calendar 1311, substitute for House Bill 5953, file 1445.

Calendar 1312, substitute for House Bill 6123, file 1468.

Calendar 1316, substitute for House Bill 6292, file 1456.

Page 22, Calendar 1322, substitute for House Bill 6447,  
file 1497.

Calendar 1324, House Bill 6525, file 1475.

Page 24, Calendar 1379, substitute for House Bill 9229,  
file 1576.

Page 25, Calendar 1383, substitute for House Bill 7744,  
file 1573.

Page 28, Calendar 1422, substitute for Senate Bill 240,

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 73

File 1608; Cal. 1365, House Bill 5578, File 1444; Cal. 1366, House Bill 5697  
File 666; Cal. 1367, House Bill 5824, File 775; Cal. 1369, House Bill 6180,  
File 1580; Cal. 1371, House Bill 6687, File 1290; Cal. 1372, House Bill 6731  
File 1469; Cal. 1373, House Bill 6842, File 1659; Cal. 1375, House Bill 7031  
File 588; Cal. 1376, House Bill 7237, File 1629; Cal. 1377, House Bill 7493  
File 1623; Cal. 1379, House Bill 7907, File 1446; Cal. 1380, House Bill 7960;  
File 1306; Cal. 1381, House Bill 8093, File 1663; Cal. 1383, House Bill 8170  
File 1621; Cal. 1386, House Bill 9220, File 1635; Cal. 1387, House Bill 9252,  
File 1672; Cal. 1389, House Bill 5154, File 913; Cal. 1390, House Bill 5286,  
File 1271; Cal. 1392, House Bill 5661, File 919; Cal. 1394, House Bill 6380  
File 1386; Cal. 1395, House Bill 6908, File 1442; Cal. 1396, House Bill 6914  
File 1388; Cal. 1397, House Bill 7438, File 890; Cal. 1398, House Bill 7450  
File 1198; Cal. 1399, House Bill 7889, File 1441; Cal. 1296, House Bill 5036  
File 746; Cal. 1297, House Bill 5147, File 1437; Cal. 1298, House Bill 5157  
File 1466; Cal. 1299, House Bill 5216; File 744; Cal. 1300, House Bill 5219  
File 949; Cal. 1301, House Bill 5247, File 1429; Cal. 1303, House Bill 5561  
File 1431; Cal. 1304, House Bill 5577, File 1289; Cal. 1306, House Bill 5754  
File 1554; Cal. 1308, House Bill 5918, File 937; Cal. 1309, House Bill 5953  
File 1445; Cal. 1310, House Bill 5957, File 1563; Cal. 1311, House Bill 5958  
File 1299; Cal. 1312, House Bill 6123, File 1468; Cal. 1313, House Bill 6292  
File 1456; Cal. 1314, House Bill 6376, File 833; Cal. 1315, House Bill 6423  
File 1458; Cal. 1316, House Bill 6470, File 923; Cal. 1317, House Bill 6512  
File 1428; Cal. 1318, House Bill 6525, File 1475; Cal. 1319, House Bill 6547  
File 1266; Cal. 1320, House Bill 6606, File 933; Cal. 1321, House Bill 6837  
File 1353; Cal. 1322, House Bill 6682, File 1352; Cal. 1323, House Bill 6885  
File 1348; Cal. 1324, House Bill 6939, File 1330; Cal. 1325, House Bill 6963

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**TRANSPORTATION**

**PART 1  
1-337**

**1971  
Index**

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

the Highway Department to include this particular area to, which is the highest noise level on the turnpike in their schedule planning and I have to say we regret that up until this point I have had no success in getting the cooperation of the Highway Department in this regard. So I would appreciate and the residents of Byram, would very much appreciate your help. Thank you very much.

Rep. Locke: Mr. Chairman, Rep. Locke from the 49th District. I'd like to speak in favor of two bills 5247 and 5147 concerning the payment of volunteer Fire Departments on State Highways and Turnpikes. They'll be further testimony given by two gentlemen from the fire service at this time. Mr. Chairman I won't take any more time, but just to say that I am in favor of both of these bills. Thank you.

Rep. O'Dea: Are there any other legislatures that want to speak on any other bills? If not can you give us the bills as they are listed in the bulletin? Is Mr. Burkholder here that wanted to speak on the bill that came up yesterday?

Mr. Burkholder: Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to speak, there was some confusion yesterday about the scheduling. Burkholder, I'm CDAP Coordinator and Assistant City Planner in the City of Norwich. I would like to speak in support on behalf of the City of Norwich of Sen. Murphys bill 375 concerning relocation of Route 2 through the City of Norwich. This bill would essentially just give needed flexibility to the Bureau of Highways in planning the relocation of this road, if you recall in the 1969 session there was money authorized for official studies on Route 2, but the language of the section of the bill was so specific that only, perhaps, could be considered by the Bureau of Highways, they have analyzed these two routes, they have very cooperative with the City of Norwich. The City of Norwich has rejected these routes, and I think the Bureaus of Highways is agrees with the cities, and the cities reasons for the rejections. In one case the Highway Coordinator suggested plans which were virtually demanded by the language of the legislation, would have cut our 64 acre redevelopment area into 2 - 17 acre sites and one 6 acre site taking out approximately 25 of the 64 acres. Though the new bill will give the Bureau of Highways, flexibility it needs to plan the relocation of the road through the city without having to consider specific routes as where suggested by the '69 legislation. The city council has gone on record in support of this concept. The Commissioner on the city plan is in the process of developing for the city, and it feels that the flexibility for the Bureau of Highways is needed and that this legislation would provide it. Thank you very much.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Sir. Now we will hear S.B. 254 AN ACT CONCERNING OPERATING OVERWEIGHT COMMERCIAL VEHICLES. HIGHWAY WEIGHING REQUIRED. PENALTY. Anyone in favor of this bill?

Lt. Griffin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I'm Lt. Griffin of the State Police Traffic Division. The State Police Department is in favor of S.B. 254 concerning operation overweight commercial vehicles. It seems it does provide for a simple method of computing fines for overweight violations. It also provides for a separate and simple method of computing overweight violations as they apply to axles. The bill further provides that the responsibility for any material removed from an overweight commercial motor vehicle to render its weight legal will remain with the owner or operator. However, we would like to propose

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

Sen. Mondani: I referred to the fact that if there was an accident and they had to divert traffic and these were on the highway, these would have to be diverted with the other traffic.

Mr. Blasko: Well, I would suggest that they be pulled over to the road and not be permitted to be rerouted. Although, for your information, these units are operated just exactly as you see them the combination of twins in downtown areas of all cities of the world, San Francisco, California, the seven hills of California without an apparent adverse effect. They can maneuver, this unit can answer better than the current 45 foot combination with a 40, I mean a 55 foot overall combination with a 45 foot box. Its much more maneuverable than that thing, this you have to see Mr. Chairman, to believe and if you would like to do it I will arrange such a display.

Rep. Reinhold: Mr. Chairman, Rep. Reinhold, Mr. Blasko thinking of the safety what happens if you jackknife with one of these double jobs.

Mr. Blasko: Mr. Reinhold you have people, I have selected three people who are involved in operation now, would you defer that question to one of the operators who is more skilled in that area than I am.

Rep. Pugliese: Rep. Pugliese, just one question, thinking in terms of the volume you anticipate I was just wondering do you have any idea of how much a decrease in volume of cabs you would be getting if this would meet the law on these highways?

Mr. Blasko: I would say it would be substantial, but first of all you would not see the State of Connecticut immediately flooded with these units, because the industry is tooling up to it and they would have to adjust to a Connecticut operation. I couldn't give you any exact figure just to say that it would be substantial and I think that United Parcel who is going to speak on this will give you some figures from their operation as to what this would mean.

Rep. O'Dea: Any other questions? Thank you Mr. Blasko.

Rep. Sarasin : Thank you Mr. O'Dea. Very briefly my name is Rep. Ronald Sarasin and I'm speaking to bill 5147 which is part of the package today. What bill 5147 does is revises 13a-248 of the Statutes. 13a-248 is a section of the Statutes that allows the state fire marshall to pay volunteer fire companies for fire fighting fires on a limited access highway, its used, of course in all areas where there are limited access highways and in the Town of Beacon Falls we have a peculiar problem, in the section of Route 8 that lies within the town is actually the Main Street of the town of Beacon Falls, it is not a limited access highway as designated by the Traffic Commissioner or any other authority, but part of the Route 8, although not designated limited access travels through the Naugatuck State Forest and if I can refer to the map--- Route 87 listed to Bridgeport and this section is not completed from the portion \_\_\_\_\_ closer to here through the Naugatuck it is not limited access and to get on and to get off, but its about 2 miles wide lies within the Naugatuck State Forest. It requires, its a prime road and a low road situation in this area and any attempt to fight a fire or to get to a fire or anything else on the Southbound lane of

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

Route 8 requires the fire company which is located in the center of Beacon Falls to drive to the rotary and turn around and come back, so that actually they're going 3 or 4 miles to get to the fire, that in most cases another situation could be reached by a ramp but not in this particular situation, there is a 2 mile stretch absolutely limited access, with no other way to get to it, but to go North and turn around go South. And what we're asking in 5147 is to add that section, not all of Route 8 through Beacon Falls, that that section of Route 8, the part that's in the Naugatuck State Forest be added to the Statute. There are other sections of Route 8 in Beacon Fall, of course, that are absolutely none limited access and we're not speaking of that, but only this purely as a practical matter absolutely limited access section that goes through the State Forest in that area. We have a situation that actually creates a greater burden on the firemen of Beacon Fall, perhaps than any other town that has to take care of fires on limited access highway, and that's the ability to get to it. It's really an extreme situation and we would hope that this Committee would look favorable on it on this request. I'm quite serious about it and I would be very interested in what happens to it. Thank you very much.

Rep. O'Dea: S.B. 379 anyone else in favor of the bill?

Mr. Connor: Thank you Gentlemen, my name is Edwin Connor, Internal Manager Freightways, East Windsor, Connecticut. I would like to speak in support of S.B. 379. For the past 2 years Gentlemen, I have been operating these 27 foot trailers to the tune of 45 to 50 a week in and out of Connecticut. I operate them as single units not hooked together of course, they come from exit 6 of the Massachusetts Turnpike where they have arrived from points as far as Buffalo and, excuse me, Akron Ohio, Akron and Buffalo, are known to us as domicile points for road drivers, they have also break bunk stations, where they perform the pure purpose of these units, to load direct to destination. Getting back to the line haul operation, when the line hold operation when these doubles are hooked, let's say Buffalo they come to the exit 6 Mass. Turnpike, the tail trailer is dropped and the lead trailer proceeds to destination. This could well be Boston, New Haven, Wooster, Providence, Boston, it then becomes my responsibility to go get the tail and bring it back to my terminal. This requires a trip of some 21 miles from the warehouse terminal, total cost to me is approximately \$400.00 per month to do this. In running these units I'm putting 20,000 pounds from a maximum of 21,000 pounds payload on each. That gives me a set load of maybe 41 or 42,000 pounds. You'll notice that is less than what we put on single semi-unit. In pulling this unit after it's hooked at the Mass Turnpike you'll notice we're using a single axle tractor as opposed to a double axle tractor pulling a semi-unit. It gives us good weight distribution better braking ability as Mr. Blaskos pointed out at a much safer frequency accident record. I'm very much in favor of them I've worked with these units for 2 years right here in Connecticut. My terminal is just  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile from the Route 91 where I use 9 miles of 91 to reach the Massachusetts line. The big benefits to the State of Connecticut, I feel are in the hands of the shippers who get much better handling of their freight, that is when this is loaded direct, such as a direct shipment of 50 pounds to 5,000 pounds to Seattle, Dallas, San Francisco, St. Louis. This is not handled, it is left on the same unit it's brought in on. same unit eliminating susceptibility to damage, loss all kinds of misuses, and of course, the service is increased because

WEDNESDAY

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 17, 1971

existing residences have been adequately and properly landscaped except where precluded by terrain conditions. The State of Connecticut should not be directed to accomplish screen plantings adjacent to parcels scheduled for future development as subdivisions, until such time as development takes place. Ineffective and possibly needless installations would probably result from such action. It is recognized that supplemental landscape planting installations will be required from time to time throughout our highway system to satisfy conditions arising from changes in abutting land use. We are cognizant of these requirements and do accomplish such planting within the limit of available funds. There is no assurance that the installation of screen plantings will materially effect a reduction in the decibels of sound encountered at residences existing in near proximity to the highway. Perhaps the greatest benefit of all is derived from placing the source of discomfort out of view. Many believe the effectiveness of screen planting installations depend upon the sensitivity of the individuals concerned and is, to a great extent, psychological. The Department of Transportation opposes Bill No. 5135 on the basis that it imposes a rather inflexible requirement and also on the basis that we can and do accomplish such planting where meaningful results can be attained.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Aryton. Anyone else opposed to 5135? The hearing is closed on this bill. The next one is H.B. 5147 AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENT TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES FOR CALLS ON ROUTE 8. Rep. \_\_\_\_\_ and Rep. Locke have already spoken of the bill.

Mr. Flannigan: The name is Ira Flannigan. Mr. Chairman, representing the Connecticut State Farms Association talking in behalf of placing the State Farms Association on record as supporting H.B. 5147. I doubt if I should try to be repetitious here because I believe that Rep. Sarsin has given a consise understanding as to the intent of the bill. And it will be very, very helpful in providing that coverage and also some compensation to the company for any specail equipment or materials that they may need and we ask that the committee kindly consider this bill and return a favorable report.

Rep. O'Dea: Thank you Mr. Flannigan. Anyone else in faovr?

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Chairman, the name is Howard Reynolds representing the Connecticut Association of Fire Chiefs, in support of this bill. If there was ever a section of highway that should be known as limited access its this particular piece, as was previously described by the Representative that introduced the bill. At places its 150 to 200 yards apart where they, almost vertical elevation between the roads and it does represent a hardship and responding comapanies having to go a couple of miles to make the swing over from one lane to the other, and we would like to support this piece of legislation. This is all this bill does, is just include this little section of 8. Thank you.

Rep. ODea: Anyone else in favor? Anyone opposed? The hearing is closed on 5147. Next bill is 5247 AN ACT INCREASING THE PAYMENT TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES FOR CALLS ON ROUTE 8. Rep. Locke has spoken in favor of the bill?

Mr. Flannigan: Chairmen, members of the committee, Ira Flannigan, representing the Connecticut State Firemens Association. The bill which you have before you for consideration is in order to keep abreast of the mounting