

HB 5781

PA 745 (vetoed)

1971

Corrections, Welfare + Humane Inst. 3-19, 22-25
(21)

House 5459-5460

(2)

Senate 3406

(1)

23

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 1
1-337**

**1971
Index**

<u>House Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Senate Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>
8900	756	194	758-763
8980	735,756	222	756
8981	732,757	224	21,45
8982	732,758	254	273,287-289
9007	687	255	245-247
9008	680,686	256	213-215
9027	791,797	257	245-247
9028	797	258	247
9029	797	259	214
9030	797	280	215-219
9031	797	281	219-221
9034	797	282	495
9050	792,798	283	243-245
9078	799	293	635-641,662,668
9103	809,884	315	84-86
9248	910-968	316	86
		324	546
		333	610
<u>Senate Bills</u>	<u>Page</u>		
42	301	336	444,447,461
76	227,243	373	253,257
77	83	374	253,257
78	14,17,26-45	375	253,257,273
79	183	376	184-186
91	539,544	377	87-91
115	340,345	378	186-188
122	758	379	274-285
123	208-210	380	387,390
124	539,544	381	274,287-289
143	92,386,412	382	289-293
145	387	385	539,544
147	83	397	523
170	68,84	411	248
171	184	420	74-80,99-104,399,779
172	483-495	423	786-790,799-805
191	9-11	424	786-789,799-805
192	213	425	786-789,799-805

<u>Senate Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Senate Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>
426	786-789, 799-805	983	350-353, 359
439	285, 290, 293, 685, 687	984	70-74, 95-98
453	812, 815	996	721
454	388	997	253, 257
532	195, 221	1007	253, 256
540	16, 232, 249	1008	253, 256, 685
573	835	1009	249, 253, 256
579	764	1010	253, 257, 320
586	343-349	1039	253, 257
587	347-349	1040	254
588	294, 349	1041	444, 448-463
629	164, 189	1042	254
631	635	1096	557
681	483-495	1101	557
682	74-80, 99-104	1109	231, 249, 765
687	388	1110	294
696	533, 542-546	1111	387, 398
697	192-198, 221-223	1112	765
698	65-67, 74-80, 99-103	1113	766
699	91-95	1114	766
703	388, 401	1115	295
705	162, 188, 558, 764	1116	766
710	314-316	1150	398
714	729, 764	1151	401-409
770	310, 316-319	1152	321
789	389	1153	396
790	389	1160	310, 321
791	389	1181	398
792	397, 559	1189	608-616
807	390-395	1206	195, 767
808	192, 195-197, 223	1233	321, 767
815	391-395	1234	546, 557
816	395	1252	539, 544
825	448	1255	308, 321
911	308, 319, 322	1278	396
929	496, 729, 764	1290	793, 805
		1291	805

<u>Senate Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>
1303	355
1308	345, 353-360
1374	539, 544
1386	459, 463
1387	447, 459, 463, 466
1388	459, 464
1389	580, 587, 616
1390	459, 464-466
1402	459, 463-466
1403	459, 463-467
1404	459, 463-468
1419	684
1432	556-558
1433	497
1434	411
1471	523
1481	566-572, 608 616-618
1526	322
1530	532, 539-544
1537	459, 465, 468
1644	728, 767
1645	728, 767
1682	625-636, 660-662
1693	789, 805-807
1704	786
1723	768
1728	756
1729	815
1745	735
1755	685
1763	783

Rules and regulations of the Transportation Dept., Motor Vehicle Dept.
and State Traffic Commission.

866-884

TRANSPORTATION

WEDNESDAY 10:00 AM

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

- H. B. No. 5532 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING AERONAUTICS DEFINITIONS.
- H. B. No. 5556 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING EXCEPTIONS TO REGISTRATION OF AIRCRAFT.
- H. B. No. 5923 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE.
- H. B. No. 5933 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT ELIMINATING THE TOLL AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE.
- H. B. No. 5934 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT ELIMINATING TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE.
- H. B. No. 5935 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE.
- S. B. No. 191 (Sen. Dupont) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS ON THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE IN PLAINFIELD AND MONTVILLE.

1
rr

TRANSPORTATION

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Representative O'Dea, Presiding

Members Present:

Senators: Mondani, Rome.
Representatives: O'Dea, Reinhold, Frate,
Gregorzek, Sweeney, Holdsworth,
Boggini, Tacinelli, Holdridge,
Nigro, Miller, Fabrizio, Grab.

Chairman O'Dea:

Good morning. We will now open the Transportation Hearing. Are there any legislators here that want to speak on any bill? We will hear them first.

Rep. Berberick:

My name is Representative Berberick of the 62nd District. Initially all I can say is that it's a wonderful day to be talking about these particular bills today, especially after yesterday. In any event, I have some notes relative to four bills relative to elimination of tolls on two exits of the Connecticut Turnpike. HB No. 5923 (Rep. Berberick of the 62nd, Rep. Blumenthal of the 56th) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB No. 5933 (Rep. Berberick of the 62nd, Rep. Blumenthal of the 56th) AN ACT ELIMINATING THE TOLL AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB No. 5934 (Rep. Berberick of the 62nd, Rep. Blumenthal of the 56th) AN ACT ELIMINATING TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB No. 5935 (Rep. Berberick of the 62nd, Rep. Blumenthal of the 56th) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE.

Just to clarify matters, I'm sure Mr. Blumenthal will speak further on it, his name was on the bills initially, I had crossed it off at his request - put it on at his request, crossed it off at his request, so I believe he's going to be speaking against them. Gentlemen, what I want to say about these particular toll stations is, if you can picture it and I'll try to show it to you on the diagram, as you come up the Connecticut Turnpike it branches off. To our left is 52 which is the Connecticut Turnpike, that continues on up through

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rep. Berberick
(Continued):

the hinterlands of eastern Connecticut on up and will eventually join in to the Massachusetts Turnpike. If you go to your right you go onto what is known as I-95 which will take you directly through New London up to Westerly, Rhode Island, right through to Boston. Now if you've traveled down in that area and you ever came to that intersection, a "V" like, if you went to your right, traffic will continually flow to the right. If you go to your left, there is nothing. The traffic is very, very, very light from there up to the top of the map, towards Massachusetts. Now the problem that we have in that area is that the normal type of employment, generally all the way up through Plainfield, Danielson, Norwich, is at the Electric Boat. People travel back and forth to get to the Electric Boat to work. They come from all over, from Rhode Island, Plainfield, Danielson down on the Turnpike. As they come down it's a quarter coming down and a quarter going back, it's a buck a day. Now if you look to your left at your neighbors going down on I-95 it's toll free naturally because of the fact it's a requirement of the Federal Government that when you put these roads, especially when you put I-95 in, it would have to be toll free or we wouldn't be allowed the federal money.

Now you can laugh and you can joke but you have real discrimination in the sense against the residents in the area. It doesn't seem right to me to see these people from Stonington, Mystic, down through that area, Rhode Island, coming in, coming in from Rhode Island now, outside of Connecticut, traveling toll free to go to work here in Connecticut where maybe 10 or 15 miles across the way where we have the Connecticut Turnpike, people are traveling along that route paying a buck a day. This is a chunk of money. Before you get to Waterford, and branch to right or left there is no problem there in that everyone who uses that Turnpike has to pay the tolls. There's no discrimination against one person or another person. It's only at this particular point that we have this discrimination, from New London up. So the reason for these particular bills is to do away with discrimination in eastern Connecticut and through that area. The second reason of course is the possibility of increasing interest in eastern Connecticut to industry. By doing this we feel that by removing the tolls, it would probably prompt industry to settle and locate within eastern Connecticut because they wouldn't be faced with this particular problem in their budget, in costs and what

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rep. Berberick
(Continued):

have you. Now probably anticipating what's going to be said, is the fact, and I know Representative Blumenthal has the exact figures, I think it's something like \$400,000 plus for Montville and \$167,000 for Plainfield. These are the net figures, net revenue. I would also like to go on record today regarding all these toll collectors who have been writing letters to the Editors regarding this. I am not after their jobs. I do not want to see them lose their jobs and I am sure they could be absorbed in other state employment as long as they have a present job now. There is a point too now. Many people say how about the bonding people? This was set up prior to I-95 when we were getting federal money and this was set up to support the turnpike. The revenues from the turnpike would go to pay off the bonds. Well we're talking about \$600,000 in tolls between the two of them each year in discrimination of eastern Connecticut residents, but more important than that I'm sure that it would be possible to contact the bonding people and this could be discussed and they would accept full faith and credit of the State of Connecticut as opposed to the turnpikes themselves. I don't think that - many people say it can't be done. I'm sure that it can be done if you were to contact the Bonding Commission on this point.

In summary then I think the main reason for these bills and two of the bills that I have introduced suggest this idea of contacting the Bonding Commission, to study this aspect, to see if it would be feasible to do it this way. The other bills were to do away with them automatically. I have no hope for those, I even have very little hope for the ones that involve contacting the Bonding Commission. I see nothing wrong with doing it, to contact them, to see if they would do this or would anticipate that they could do this. Change it to the full faith in credit. In summary then I think the main points for the bill as submitted is to do away with this idea of discrimination against certain residents in the State as opposed to other residents. The only place that it exists is here in eastern Connecticut. The secondary reason of course is the potential increase of industry settling in the area could not put up with these particular tolls. Thank you.

Rep. Holdsworth:

Aren't toll books available for the residents at these two toll stations, the same as they are at all the rest of the toll stations?

4
rr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

- Rep. Berberick: I believe they are but they're rather limited. The situation isn't wonderful. I think they have something like 50 or 60 days.
- Rep. Holdsworth: This reduces the tolls from 25 cents to 8-1/3 cents so that this materially reduces. You indicated that this was the only place where there was discrimination. Are you aware of the other toll stations in the State on the Connecticut Turnpike?
- Rep. Berberick: Yes I am.
- Rep. Holdsworth: Don't we have discrimination there too?
- Rep. Berberick: No. In those areas everyone who uses the Connecticut Turnpike pays. Where I'm talking about, where you branch off you have an alternative. I-95.
- Rep. Holdsworth: We have the same thing in Stratford, West Haven and all the rest of the areas. I mean I don't see how you can say ...
- Rep. Berberick: I don't think this is the same thing.
- Rep. Holdsworth: I don't see how you can say you only have discrimination in the eastern part of Connecticut.
- Rep. Berberick: I think you're misinterpreting what I'm saying. If you want me to repeat it again. I'm saying when you get down to New London you have two multiple lane, limited access highways that go essentially in the same direction, north to the northern part of Connecticut towards Massachusetts. One is 52 which is the Connecticut Turnpike. The other one is I-95 which is a multiple lane, limited access highway. Both run in the same direction and both go essentially to the same spot. This is where I say discrimination comes. It's like having two multiple lane highways running right with one another.
- Senator Rome: Is it really the idea of discrimination because if you give them an alternative they're going to go on I-95?
- Rep. Berberick: Well if they want to travel all over the hinterlands to get on I-95.
- Chairman O'Dea: Any further questions? Thank you Representative.

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rep. Blumenthal:

Representative Blumenthal from the 56th District. I would first like to state that I am opposed to these bills and that my name was to be taken from these bills. Back in November I was approached by Representative Berberick about the possibility of sponsoring a bill to take the tolls off. At that time without any figures it was my off-hand impression that we were losing money on the toll booths because I do travel the turnpike in eastern Connecticut and see very few cars go through the toll booths. However, at some time in December when I received the figures from the Auditors I realized that I could not in good conscience support a bill to take off these tolls. For instance I have figures I'm leaving with the Committee today. These tolls, the Plainfield toll netted \$167,000 for the fiscal year 1969-70 and the Montville toll netted \$449,000 for the fiscal year 1969-70. On top of this it showed a substantial increase over the prior year, which means the traffic in eastern Connecticut has been increasing. The revenue is also increasing at a faster rate than the expenses which means the percentage of increase net to the State of Connecticut is also increasing. The next point is that there are forty-five people working at these toll booths and even though we say they could be absorbed in other areas of State Government many of them are in their fifties and some of them are near retirement and it would be a hardship to transfer them. The figures will show that less than 5% of the income comes from commuter tickets, which are available, 42 tickets for \$3.50 for a 30-day period. Now there are some bills in and I have a bill in to change these tickets to 60 days. The toll takers tell me that all the people who commute are all primarily in car pools, with four and five people per car. As you can realize not only does this help out the people driving, it helps out air pollution problems, traffic problems and everything else. I think we should encourage car pools.

Some of the other things that the toll takers do is check on stolen car numbers, it acts I think as a safety aspect for speeding drivers and drowsy drivers in the wee hours of the morning. The blinking lights and the fact they've got to fish in their pockets for money.. and also they help make emergency calls many times when people have broken down on the turnpike. For these reasons I strongly oppose taking off these tolls. I do not feel they are a detriment to the growth of eastern Connecticut

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Rep. Blumenthal
(Continued):

and I feel that the turnpike must be paid for in this revenue at this critical time in the State's finances. A net of \$616,000 is warranted.

Chairman O'Dea:

Any questions from the Committee?

Rep. Sweeney:

I have a statement from the toll collectors at Montville they asked me to submit at the hearing. Total traffic and revenue through the Montville Toll Station, so I'll just leave it here with the Committee. They had 2,713,118 vehicles go through the Montville Toll Station in 1970 - a 9.6% increase over 1969, and a total revenue of \$645,000.00, a 9% increase over 1969. They asked me to submit these.

Chairman O'Dea:

Any other questions? Any other legislators to speak on any bills? If not we'll start the hearing. The first bill we'll hear is HB No. 5532 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING AERONAUTICS DEFINITIONS. Anyone to speak in favor of this bill?

Mr. Donald Lynch:

Mr. Chairman. I am Donald Lynch, Chief Executive Officer of the Bureau of Aeronautics. The Commissioner of Transportation is in favor of this bill. It would add two more definitions to our statutes to clarify cases and instances where we now have confusion, and can't enforce our regulations or can't determine what is base of aircraft or use of aircraft. The bill itself is self-explanatory. If there are any questions I'll be glad to answer them. I'll leave these with you.

Rep. Frate:

Are you trying to get to that problem we have down in my part of the State, Colt's Pond?

Mr. Donald Lynch:

Partly sir. This would determine where an aircraft would be based. We've explained in this bill if it's there overnight it's considered a based aircraft. Up to this point we have occasional landings and we have no definition of occasional landings, we have no definition of based aircraft and this will clarify it.

Rep. Frate:

Do you have any other problems in the State besides that one?

Mr. Donald Lynch:

Yes. Many places where an aircraft might land off and on. We have a history of aircraft, both land and sea, landing periodically at some infrequent or unscheduled times at either lakes or land and the owner of the aircraft claiming it is an occasional landing and he can land at that site without a license. This now clarifies that point so we will

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Mr. Donald Lynch
(Continued):

know whether it is an occasional landing or not. The word "based" is used frequently in our Statute and now we've clarified it by saying if it's overnight it's based there, so then we can move to license if he used it more often than stated, we can license or not license the strip, stop them from operating or permit them to continue operating. We've clarified the Statute, that's what we're trying to do.

Rep. Frate:

My only concern is that, like the situation we have in Darien and Stamford at Colt's Pond. Now you're going to give the person the right to come in twice a month and especially in the summertime with a bunch of kids out there with little sailboats. The local YMCA for instance has a course where they teach kids how to sail boats and then you have a plane coming in there and you're going to allow them to come in twice a month. You know you have a hazard there.

Mr. Donald Lynch:

I have to say that in the past and existing statutes and regulations he could claim landing there every day was just an occasional landing and our hands were tied. Now we're shooting it down to a limit. We're imposing a limit and if it does more than that, it 's more than an occasional landing which means then the site has to be licensed. This is our control. In fact it was developed partly from the case in your back yard. Thank you.

Chairman O'Dea:

Thank you Mr. Lynch. Anyone else in favor of HB 5532 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING AERONAUTICS DEFINITIONS. Anyone opposed to the bill? The hearing is closed. We will now hear HB 5556 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING EXCEPTIONS TO REGISTRATION OF AIRCRAFT. Anyone in favor of the bill?

Mr. Donald Lynch:

Presently under our existing regulations, we define a 90-day time limit for permission to aircraft to operate in the State from out of the State. But we do hope now to incorporate this into a statute so that we have more control on those aircraft which are from an adjoining state. If they are in Connecticut for 90 days then they must be licensed in Connecticut and help support the facilities in Connecticut.

Our Commissioner of Transportation endorses this bill. I'll leave this copy of our statement with you.

8
rr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Chairman O'Dea:

Any questions?

Senator Rome:

Mr. Lynch. Licensing in Connecticut would mean a license in full. Would there be any other benefits which would accrue to the State of Connecticut?

Mr. Donald Lynch:

The Bureau of Aeronautics transfers a copy of that registration to the Tax Department. Now the Tax Department determines whether it's taxable. But it is a means of getting licensed aircraft to the Tax Department. It would not be our responsibility to determine that.

Senator Rome:

I was just wondering what the ramifications were.

Mr. Donald Lynch:

The licensing is minor. We do by the license transfer that information to the Tax Department so they know then it is licensed.

Chairman O'Dea:

Any further questions. Thank you Mr. Lynch. Anyone else in favor of HB 5556 (Rep. O'Dea) AN ACT CONCERNING EXCEPTIONS TO REGISTRATION OF AIRCRAFT. Is there anyone opposed to the bill? If not hearing is closed.

We will now move on to HB 5923 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB 5933 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT ELIMINATING THE TOLL AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB 5934 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT ELIMINATING TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE AND PLAINFIELD EXITS OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; HB 5935 (Rep. Berberick, Rep. Blumenthal) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS AT THE MONTVILLE EXIT OF THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE; SB 191 (Sen. Dupont) AN ACT CONCERNING THE ELIMINATION OF TOLLS ON THE CONNECTICUT TURNPIKE IN PLAINFIELD AND MONTVILLE.

Is there anyone in favor of any of these bills?
Is there anyone opposed to any of these bills?

Mr. Arthur FitzGibbons:

My name is Arthur FitzGibbons, Chief of Revenues, Department of Transportation. These bills all concern the elimination of tolls at the Montville and Plainfield Toll Stations or to provide for their elimination at such time as the Commissioner

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Mr. Arthur FitzGibbons
(Continued):

of Transportation determines that said elimination will not interfere with the bond commitments of the State.

The comments of the Department of Transportation are that the tolls charged and collected on the Connecticut Turnpike were established by a competent firm of engineers as necessary to provide for the repayment of the Turnpike Bonds.

The Connecticut Turnpike Bond Declaration and Sections 13a-122 (b) and 13a-156(b) of the General Statutes, convey to the Commissioner the power to have such studies made, if and when considered necessary, by competent Traffic Engineers to determine what changes, if any, would be beneficial to the motoring public and the bondholders alike.

Until such time as the Engineers determine that the requirements of the Bonds are being totally satisfied and that the Highway Fund is being fully reimbursed for the Turnpike operating, maintenance and reconstruction expenses, the Department of Transportation feels that no consideration should be given to a reduction in the revenue of the Turnpike.

For these reasons, the Department of Transportation questions the need of such legislation and therefore opposes these bills.

Rep. Holdridge:

Is it possible for the Bonding Commission to release these bonds? Is there any way it could be done? I've always understood that we couldn't take any of the tolls off because of the bonds.

Mr. Arthur FitzGibbons:

It would be my understanding that the only way you could take any of these tolls off would be by some other measure of repaying bonds.

Rep. Holdridge:

It could be done, if there was some other way then?

Mr. Arthur FitzGibbons:

This is a legal question that I'm sorry to say I don't feel qualified to answer. I would feel quite sure that the bondholders are only interested in the payment of the bonds.

Rep. Holdridge:

Well I've always understood that the tolls couldn't be taken off on account of the bonds. I wondered if there was some way it could be done.

10
rr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

- Mr. Arthur FitzGibbons: Is this true Mr. Lynch, would you say?
- Mr. William Lynch: The bonds would have to be re-issued. They would have to be redeemed.
- Rep. Holdridge: How could they be redeemed?
- Mr. William Lynch: My name is William Lynch. I'm an Administrative and Legislative Advisor for the Bureau of Highways. The State has entered into a contract with the bondholders and until such time as this contract is redeemed the tolls could not be taken off the Turnpike.
- Senator Mondani: New bonds could be issued. If you remove a resident bond you have to replace it with something. You can still owe \$90,000,000.
- Rep. Frate: I don't think a lot of our members understand the Connecticut Turnpike bonds. The toll collectors they are talking about - that money comes out of the Highway Fund. The tolls themselves go to the bond revenue to pay the interest and liquidate the bonds. So the toll collectors are paid out of the highway fund. A lot of these people probably don't know that.
- Chairman O'Dea: Anyone else opposed. If not the hearing is closed.

ll
rr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Statement of Mr. Donald Lynch, State Department of Transportation, HB No. 5532
AN ACT CONCERNING AERONAUTICS DEFINITIONS.

In the statute that covered licensing of airports, there is a provision that states that they shall be licensed except "other than for an occasional landing or take-off by aircraft". We have been hampered in the enforcement of this statute by the claim of many aircraft owners that they are only using a certain area on an occasional basis. This could be anything from one landing and take-off in the last ten years to as much as a landing and take-off every day. By the acceptance of this definition, we will have some criteria to say when a landing area has to be licensed.

Under present Section 15-59, registration requirements are determined if an aircraft is owned by a resident of the State and is based in another State, etc. The definition of based has never been officially determined and has been a matter of controversy in enforcement procedures. The proposed definition will provide a standard which may be applied in the enforcement of Connecticut Regulations on aircraft registration.

12
rr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 17, 1971

Statement of Mr. Donald Lynch, State Department of Transportation, HB No. 5556
AN ACT CONCERNING EXCEPTIONS TO REGISTRATION OF AIRCRAFT.

Aircraft from adjoining states which are actually located at Connecticut airports for more than 25% of the time and use the airport facilities and services during that time should participate in State costs to support these facilities. The present implementing regulation does list this criteria. The Department of Transportation supports this change.

1
mr

TRANSPORTATION

TUESDAY

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Senator Mondani, presiding

Members present:

Senators: Mondani, Rome

Representatives: O'Dea, Reinhold, Nickols,
Gregorzek, Boggini, Pugliese,
Ryan, Miller, Connors, Holdridge

Chairman Mondani: The hearing will begin. We are sorry for the delay. We will still allow a half hour for the Legislators to be heard. Mrs. Clark?

Rep. Clark:

I am Rep. Ruth Clark of the 101st. District. I favor S. B. 78 (Sen. Hammer, 12th.) AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE OVER ROUTE 146 IN BRANFORD. In 1967 two million dollars was appropriated for project 14-81, to replace a railroad underpass which floods during storms and during high tides, and only has about an eight inch clearance, so that trucks continually wrap up against it. There is no question in my mind the this underpass needs to be replaced by a bridge, so that Route 146 will be open at all times. And further, that there will be sidewalks so that children and adults living south of the river will be able to walk safely to the Community House in the center of Branford. The area to the south of the present underpass is a highly populated area. I did not visualized realignment of the whole area in connection with the replacing of the railroad underpass. There is an overpass on Curtin Street in Branford that has a sidewalk and is closer to the size and fitting type for such an area and is closer to what most of the townspeople envisioned. There would be no temptation on the part of a driver to speed over it, because curves do not encourage speed as a straight-away does. S. B. 78 would prevent the construction of a speed-way approach into this highly built-up residential area, as well as preserving additional wetlands.

I believe, in these days, when no new funding for highways is available, that the pressing problems already in existing should be remedied at the least possible cost, even if it means constructing a bridge on Route 146, that is not based on federal highway standards, as to grade. After all, it is not a federal highway.

4
mr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Rep. Clark:
(Continued)

concern on the part of the Selectmen about the traffic on Route 1, in view of the construction of the new shopping center. I would like to give those to you. And I also have a copy of the letter to Lucy Hammer and me on the subject of cutting down the bridge. And I shall be happy to leave these maps with you. Mrs. Hammer is in bed with the flu and unfortunately has a statement. Oh, you have it there. I would be happy to read that if you want to hear it. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Senator Rome?

Senator Rome:

Senator Rome of the 8th. District. As you understand, Senator Hammer is sick with the flu and she has asked me to introduce her comments on H. B. 6160, S. B. 540 and S. B. 78. I think that her comments are self-explanatory and there are copies of these statements for each one on the committee. Thank you.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Representative?

Rep. Sarasin:

Good morning, Gentlemen. I am Rep. Sarasin from the 95th. District, Seymour, Beacon Falls and Bethany. I have several bills I wish to comment briefly on and perhaps in the way of explanation if I could point them out on a map of the State of Connecticut, it may help to make some sense out of it. And, those are not duplicate maps, I want to point out.

The first one is, where I can point the area out is, H. B. 5146 (Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT INCLUDING HOLEBROOK ROAD IN SEYMOUR IN THE STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS. Now, on this map it is a dotted black line and a circle around this small road which actually connects Route 67, which is a state highway, and Route 188. It is the heavily traveled connector between these two roads and it is the only one, really, that effectively connects the two. Basically, it is a problem for the town of Seymour, in maintenance and so forth, mainly because of the fact it is used primarily to reach one highway or the other. It seems reasonable because this is the only major east-west highway connector between these two highways that it should be incorporated in the state systems of highways.

The next bill I would like to talk about does not appear on the map, but that is H. B. 5149 (Sarsin) AN ACT CONCERNING THE INSTALLATION OF BLINKERS ON ROUTE 8 IN BEACON FALLS. The request in this bill

5
mr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Rep. Sarasin:
(Continued)

is to install blinker lights to allow at a location which is front of the volunteer fire company which is in the town of Beacon Falls. The fire company faces Main Street, or Route 8, in Beacon Falls, and I point out to you, gentlemen, that this area of Route 8 is the only area left in the state except the part that hasn't been completed in Bridgeport, that is not limited access. The area from Winsted, down to Naugatuck, then again starting in Seymour, going through Shelton, is all limited access on Route 8. We have a severe traffic problem because Route 8 here is actually the Main Street of the town of Beacon Falls. It is a four lane highway, median divider in the center, but it is still the Main Street of this community.

Now, what we are asking here is that blinker lights be installed to allow the fire company to safely get the fire vehicles from the fire company out across the south-bound lane to the north-bound lane, when necessary. Now, I don't think that it is an unreasonable request and it would certainly add to the safety of the community and the firemen.

Another bill, Gentlemen, is H. B. 5206 (Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF ROUTE 67 IN SEYMOUR. That, Gentlemen, is pointed out on another map. And it points to a very sharp corner on Route 67, and this is the location in Seymour known as Hoadley's Bridge. Now, there is a case, decided by the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut, which says that the design of that roadway, in this location, is defective. I would submit, Gentlemen, that any accident is automatically entitled to come to the state and say "pay me". Because the design of the road is a defect. It is actually a severe right angle turn if you are headed northerly or a left angle turn if you are headed southerly, at a bridge which, unfortunately, over the years, has dumped many automobiles into the pond, including many fatalities. The basic problem, the design of the roadway, it is an old road, which simply grew, and it is - I will try to get that citation - it has actually been turned as defective in design.

Another bill, Gentlemen, is H. B. 5207 (Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR RECONSTRUCTION, RELOCATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF ROUTE 42 IN BEACON FALLS. Now, this bill is really part of another bill that is 5642, which calls for the improvement of Route 42 from Route 10 in Cheshire to Route 67 in Oxford. Now, Route 42 is designated as a state highway but it can hardly be called this. It is an accumulation

6
mr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Rep. Sarasin:
(Continued)

Of local roads, some in very poor condition, that the state, several years ago decided to take into the state systems of highways. And very little has been done in the way of improvements to these. The Cheshire area includes what is known as the Bethany Mountain which has some very severe "S" turns in it, if any of you are familiar with it. Through the town of Bethany and the towns of Beacon Falls and Oxford, it has some severe corners, bad locations; is extremely narrow; accident prone. It is really a shame to call it a state highway but it is. Some areas have been taken on by the state in the sense of widening and relocation and straightening out of corners, but some of it has not been touched. And, it is an area that vitally needs attention. It is now busier than ever, because it is well-marked, for a long time nobody knew where it was; now it is and it gets a great deal of traffic, including heavy trailer truck traffic. The roads were never designed for this kind of traffic; they are not up to that capacity at all and in some cases it is simply not wide enough for it.

I would ask the Committee to look seriously at Route 42. As I said earlier, bill 5207, is one small area located in Beacon Falls from Route 8 to a street in Beacon Falls called Burton Road. Part of this area has been refurbished by the state, most of it creates serious problems, truck traffic. There is a gravel bank in the vicinity which doesn't help the situation. It is a state highway and it should receive some state attention.

Another bill, Gentlemen, and I think I will be through - is H. B. 5641 (Rep. Sarasin) AN ACT PROVIDING FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF SILVERMINE ROAD IN SEYMOUR. Silvermine Road is not a state highway but into Route 67, and on a curve on Route 67 and on an extremely poor situation, a blind corner. And it is the Route 67 part of it that needs the state's attention, in correcting, if possible, the blind corner and make access to Route 67 to Silvermine Road a great deal safer than it is today. Gentlemen, thank you very much.

Chairman Mondani: Thank you. Senator Petroni?

Senator Petroni: Good morning, Mr. Co-Chairman and members of the Transportation Committee. For the record, I am Romeo Petroni, of the 24th. District. I would register my approval of H. B. 5148, 5143, 5735

7
mr

TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 23, 1971

Senator Petroni:
(Continued)

and S. B. 224. To begin with H. B. 5143 (Sen. Petroni and Rep. Collins) AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HIGHWAY CONNECTING ROUTE 53 IN THE TOWN OF BETHEL AND ROUTE 7. It has the support of Rep. Collins, who unfortunately has another hearing this morning, and could not be here but asked me to speak for him, in support of this bill and also of bill 5148. This calls for nine million dollars which would give Bethel a direct connector with the proposed, and hopefully, new Route 7. So it would connect it with south-western Connecticut. Bethel is somewhat isolated from the new Route 7 but even more isolated, today, from Route 84. Route 84 is this great highway which starts in Danbury and goes all the way to here, we travel it, I do anyway, almost every day now; and I certainly enjoy the benefits of it and enjoy what is happening along 84. I think that industry will develop along both sides of it, from Danbury at least, through Waterbury. But, it is most important that towns along it have the convenience and the benefits from it. Bethel, unfortunately is isolated from it from this point. And you can see industry growing along both sides of 84 in Danbury and now you can see it in Newtown and you will see it in Newbury as you come up from Danbury east. And I think that it is imperative for Bethel to have 5148 because these connectors are the real life-lines from the major highways, for industry to move goods from one point to another. And at this time, I think that it is practical for the state to purchase the rights-of-ways because there would be a minimum displacement of people and houses on the proposed connector route as to 5148. The price of the land would be more reasonable, of course, and there is a natural corridor from Route 84 to Bethel. Which I am sure the First Selectman, and Senate Clerk Charles McCollum and their road foreman are here and they will speak as to the desirability of both these bills but also the practicality of the connector from I-84 to the center of Bethel. And, it would open hundreds of acres for industrial use. It has bi-partisan support, as you can see. It was also considered by this committee in 1969 and it is supported on a bi-partisan basis. And, Bethel, I think, should be seriously considered in this session for this road.

The other bill, H. B. 5143, I mentioned is probably of lesser importance, in my mind, than 5148, although I support both of them.

Monday, June 7, 1971

123.

MR. PAPANDREA: (78th)

Mr. Speaker, may this item be Passed, Retaining its Place on the Calendar.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1070. Sub. for S.B. 1532. AN ACT CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT FOR SALARIES AND OTHER EXPENSES TO MUNICIPAL WELFARE DEPARTMENTS, amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 78th.

MR. PAPANDREA: (78th)

May this matter also be Passed, Retaining its Place on the Calendar.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1082. Sub. for H.B. 5781. AN ACT CONCERNING HALF-WAY HOUSES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Billington of the 7th.

MR. BILLINGTON: (7th)

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

THE SPEAKER:

Would you remark.

roc

Monday, June 7, 1971

124.

MR. BILLINGTON: (7th)

Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for the Commissioner of the Department of Children and Youth Services to set up half-way houses for children and youth who are under the jurisdiction of the department. They would receive academic tutoring, employment counseling and other rehabilitant services. They would contribute part of the job Xearnings to the house. The appropriation for this service, Mr. Speaker, would be \$250,000. This is a good bill. It allows a child with behavior problems to take advantage of state services without being committed to the institution of criminally delinquents. By separating this child he is given a better chance to become a normal, productive citizen by working together with others. I think it is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and it ought to pass.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill. If not, all those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. THE BILL IS PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1083. Sub. for H.B. 5782. AN ACT CONCERNING community MULTI-SERVICE CENTERS FOR YOUTH IN TROUBLE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 7th. Rep. Billington.

MR. BILLINGTON: (7th)

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

roc

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 77

File numbers and I'll move for suspension for immediate consideration.

They should be in the Clerk's possession and we'll file this list too, if he wishes.

THE CHAIR:

That's what we're talking about, Senator. We want to compare the bills themselves, against the list we have.

Would you come up, Senator Ives and we'll expediate this very quickly?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of the following bills:

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection it is so ordered.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, House Bill 5109, File 1268; House Bill 5298, File 1699; House Bill 5433, File 1310; House Bill 5730, File 940; House Bill 5781, File 1196; House Bill 5782, File 1211; House Bill 6277, File 289; House Bill 6411, File 1117; House Bill 6448, File 1377; House Bill 6685, File 1461; House Bill 6716, File 1684; House Bill 6927, File 934; House Bill 7170, File 769; House Bill 7811, File 1104; House Bill 8410, File 1106; House Bill 8225, File 1197; House Bill 8796, File 927; House Bill 8835, File 1305; House Bill 9189, File 1453; House Bill 6928, File 1080; House Bill 8485, File 1642.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the bills listed.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the adoption or passage of the bills? Hearing none; said bills declared passed.