

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-759		5771	37	10	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>State & Urban Development 99-135</i> 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5790-5799 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3408

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226**

Tuesday, June 8, 1971 236

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I find no provision in this bill which would retain the individual liability of an architect or professional engineer, like the bills which allow lawyers, for instance, to incorporate. In that respect, I think the bill is defective. I think it could be interpreted as limiting the individual liability of an architect or engineer and, therefore, I would oppose the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is LOST.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1462, H.B. No. 6848, An Act Concerning Combined Corporation Business Tax Returns.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 78th moves to recommit on page 13, the third calendar item, Calendar No. 1462. Will you remark? Is there objection? Hearing none, the item indicated is recommitted.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1485, substitute for H.B. No. 5771, An Act Concerning Community Development Action Plans.

MR. METTLER (96th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

237

Will you remark?

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, the bill before you tonight is the result of the work of an interim sub-committee of the Committee on State Developments, who spent much of the term--

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Pearson is on her feet. For what purpose does the lady rise?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

I believe there is an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman was moving adoption, acceptance and passage. I'm sure the Clerk then would have called amendments.

MR. METTLER (96th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, this bill is the result of an interim subcommittee which monitored both DCA and CDAP during the interim period between sessions. Since there are some amendments, I will withhold further comments, Mr. Speaker, and ask the Clerk to please read the first amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk is in possession of three amendments.

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Clerk, if you'll read the first amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mrs. Pearson of the 128th, consisting of four pages.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the lady from the 128th care to outline the amendment?

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

238

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr. Speaker, yes I would briefly explain what the amendment does. To a great degree, it would repeal all the statutory provisions relative to the Community Development Action plan.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance and passage of House Amendment Schedule "A" and would like to comment.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

The contract that a community signs when it becomes part of a CDAP is very binding and if that community fails to complete a project for which it has received money from the DCA, the commissioner has the right to confiscate town property, the funds of the agency and to complete the project himself. The CDAP that I am asking to repeal in this amendment actually does not strengthen any of our local governments and I feel that it is more of a dictatorship than doing any type of strengthening of our individual freedom. I don't feel that you can strengthen a local government by usurping the various local powers and placing them under the jurisdiction of the DCA. In the process, the CDAP has become, what I call, a state imposed pork barrel program which actually forces a program, a town to spend thousands of dollars on hundreds of--

THE SPEAKER:

The Representative is not being heard.

ad

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

239

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

ad

I must be boring. Which forces communities to spend thousands of dollars on hundreds of superfluous political patronage jobs for CDAP co-ordinators and assistants in order for the towns to receive funding. Proponents of the DCA would have you believe that the communities join because they want to or because the CDAP is a good program. Almost no community has adopted a CDAP because it wants to and almost no community adopted a CDAP because they thought it was a good program. Most all of them have joined and adopted a CDAP, those that have because they have been forced to in order to adopt a program to receive the funding for their much needed local programs. I maintain that the program of CDAP is a duplication. I do feel that it is a waste of paper and time and a waste of money and I move the acceptance of the amendment.

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I think that next to pregnancy, there are more wivestales about CDAP than anything else in the State of Connecticut. Interim sub-committee No. 5, which went about the state, as I say for the past eighteen months, into community after community, looking at the CDAP process, came away convinced on the basic validity of the program. There is no question about it. In town after town, where the CDAP program had been implemented, we heard laudatory comments about the program and its impact upon those towns. It gave the towns an opportunity to inventory their resources, both human as well as physical. The bill we are considering tonight will, when we get to it, will make the CDAP an optional program.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the members give their attention to Fort CDAP?

MR. METTLER (96th):

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

240

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no point in taking four years of progressive work in this state and throwing it away as this amendment would so casually do. I strongly oppose the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The amendment is LOST.

The Clerk will call Amendment Schedule "B".

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Mr. Orcutt of the 100th.

Delete section 4 in its entirety.

In line 415, change section 5 to read "Section 4."

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, speaking in favor of this amendment, this amendment eliminates section 4 which imposes a formula for distribution of state grants to support CDAP if any money happens to be in whatever budget is adopted by this legislature. I feel that this provision is not necessary. It eliminates the flexibility and the discretion that the commissioner of community affairs has and I think that this amendment, by removing this section, improves the bill a great deal and I move its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment Schedule "B"?

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, I regret but with all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from the 100th district, I rise to oppose Amendment Schedule "B". The

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

241

purpose of adding section 4 to the bill before you is quite simple. In the past four years, 77 towns in this state have either produced a finished CDAP or are in the process of creating one. With the present attitude of the administration toward the program, the state and urban development committee felt that the very least that we could do for those towns who have taken these preliminary steps, would be to afford them a minimum of financial support to carry out the work already begun. The formula in the plan calls for a per capita grant to be given to each town which has either adopted a CDAP or is in the process. The total amount comes to approximately \$420,000. It is in the Democratic budget. We feel that this money is vital to the towns throughout our state. We feel that it will allow them to continue the good work already begun. I urge rejection of Amendment "B".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on Amendment Schedule "B"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? "B" is DEFEATED.

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "C" offered by Mr. Orcutt of the 100th.

In lines 360 and 361, delete the following language: "providing legal services to any person unable to afford a lawyer".

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of Amendment Schedule "C".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

242

ad

Mr. Speaker, as the Clerk indicated, this bill removes new language, this amendment rather, removes new language being put into the statutes which provide that hurt money, money for anti-poverty programs, can be now, under this new language, be used to provide legal services to any person unable to afford a lawyer. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an improper use of the funds that we have allocated to this program. I think that we have other programs that provide this service and I think that this language should delete it and I move the adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment "C"?

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will not be too much of a shock in the hall of the House, but I approve of this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment "C"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? "C" is ADOPTED.

MR. METTLER (96th):

Mr. Speaker, I now move acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "C".

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further?

MR. METTLER (96th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, what the bill basically does now is it exempts or removes the mandatory CDAP requirement for the twelve state programs that are financed under the Department of Community Affairs. It makes CDAP optional for any community in the state while at the same time, more clearly defining

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

243

the requirements of a CDAP if a town should decide to go into it. In addition, it has the grant plan which has already been discussed. I think it will be a big step forward in a plan that will have great meaning to the future of our state and I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended by Amendment "C"?

MR. ORCUTT (100th):

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the bill as amended, I'd like to associate myself with the remarks of Rep. Mettler. I believe that this legislation will strengthen CDAP by making it optional and not a prerequisite for any of the DCA grant programs. A great many communities have found this program to be an excellent one and are very much interested in continuing it. Others do not care to participate. I think that by providing this new statute we are taking into consideration the desires, the various desires of all the communities in the state. It's an excellent bill and I move its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Mr Speaker, speaking on the bill, I maintain that it would be really ridiculous to keep the CDAP as it's obviously a duplication of sections 8-220 and portions of 8-206 and we actually have municipal plans of development that the towns have adopted and do adopt and keep updating. I think this bill will perpetuate red tape and the duplication of effort. Also, the CDAP agency, as established in--

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. Pearson.

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

244

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

The CDAP agency that has been established in section c of 8-207 has authority that should not be there. I maintain that this authority belongs to the local elected officials and not to a CDAP agency. In line 272 of the bill, it gives the agency power, the word action is used, in line 283, it gives them authority to engage employees and technical assistants. This is just what our municipalities really cannot afford to have an agency with this particular power. This bill is really no major renovation at all. This bill is tokenism and it's designed to make the legislators and the people of the State of Connecticut think that the bureaucracy of this department is being curtailed. It is not. There are no humanitarian motives here in this bill or with this amended changes in the statute. I maintain there are purely political motives behind this bill. I think we need a small net of local administrators to help the towns but not to hinder them or obstruct or to get in the way of the business that they must do. I'm very strong in my feeling about simplifying government, not trying to complicate it in order to justify existence of this program that I have maintained is actually duplication. I oppose the bill, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks?

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Oh, wait a minute.

THE SPEAKER:

That's a new motion! I'll wait a minute.

MRS. PEARSON (128th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Oh, I've lost on this one anyway so go for one more. People who have actually buried our state in a quagmire of red tape, and this program really does this, as I said it's duplication. I feel it's

ad

Tuesday, June 8, 1971

245

a needless duplication and the people that have been speaking in favor of this particular bill and the CDAP and this department, I think they've been covering up their bungling of millions of dollars by false praise and phony news releases that this department has been issuing. I think that they have unethical and sleazy public relations department. I think it's really a disgrace to the State of Connecticut and our government and I feel it's an insult to the people who look to their state for honesty and integrity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks before we vote? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage as amended by Amendment Schedule "C". All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Sorry, Marilyn, the bill is PASSED.

MR. ... (unidentified)

Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

MR. ... (unidentified)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if you could have these lights turned off. I don't see that the cameramen are at their cameras. It's very hot here and I'd appreciate it if that could be done.

MR. PAPANDREA (78th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The next item, Mr. Speaker, will be Calendar No. 1486, substitute for H. B. No. 5882, File No. 1669.

MR. PROVENZANO (127th):

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

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 79

THE CHAIR:

Question is on suspension of the rules, any objection. You may proceed

SENATOR CALDWELL:

I move adoption of the following bills: Senate Bill 383 and 384; House Bill 8464; House Bill 6025; House Bill 6006; House Bill 5052; House Bill 5771; House Bill 5962; Senate Bill 1807; House Bill 9097;

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage, of those bills that came up from the House, as amended. All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? The ayes have it; the bills are passed.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules, for immediate consideration of Cal. 1370, Substitute House Bill 6447.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on suspension of the rules. Any objection? No objection you may proceed.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This is the one year limitation on Welfare.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye".

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. For the record, Mr. President this bill is not a one-year residency requirement. It's not an act concern-

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**STATE
AND
URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**

**PART 1
1-275**

**1971
Index**

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Senator Joseph I. Lieberman,
Representative Victor Tudan, presiding

Members present: Senators: Lieberman, DeNardis, Odegard
Representatives: Tudan, Clarke, Kablik, Hogan,
Gaffney, King, Edwards, Bigos, Boggini,
Gudelski, Taneszio, Mahoney, Carragher,
DiMeo, Orcutt, Dzialo, Blumenthal

Rep. Tudan: We are going to open up the public part of the hearing. Just two bills - 5494, 5771. This was by design, because we thought that today we'd discuss only CDAP, so that we do have numerous microphones around here. Be sure that when you do get up and speak to identify yourself, and try to stay on the subject. The hearing is open on 5494, and you can comment, if you care to, on 5771, either one. Representative Rose?

Rep. Rose, 69th District: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the State and Urban Commission, I am speaking in favor of Bill 5494, which I have introduced, which is an attempt at least to restore back to the towns the right to the tax money that they have paid to the Federal Government on projects which they would like to promote under the HUD program. At present, as you well know, it is necessary for the towns, in order to get these funds and to get this help that is filtered through the state CDAP program, and it is necessary therefore for them to have a CDAP program in operation. I feel that this is unfair, and that many towns would actually proceed with some of the ideas which would be beneficial to the towns as well as the state if they did not have to involve themselves with the complications, as they see it, of the CDAP program. I think it really is a case of townspeople in the state being taxed without proper representation when they are not allowed to have a voice really in the federal fund, not referring now to funds created by the state, but by funds created by the federal government, which is the HUD program which now, under the law, requires that it come through the CDAP program, and this is the request of this bill. To provide an alternative to the preparation of a community development action plan as a prerequisite for receipt by a municipality of state financial assistance, specifically HUD assistance.

Rep. Tudan: Thank you.

Rep. Pearson, 128th District: Mr. Chairman, Committee, I do feel that House Bill 5494, though submitted by Rep. Rose, and not concerning the Community Development Action Plan, is the very least that should be done to protect the taxpayers' money on the federal level, and I do feel that, if you do nothing else with the particular program, that this would be a step I feel in the right direction, as an alternative to the CDAP. On 5771, the bill does not

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FEBRUARY 24, 1971

really say too much except to establish different categories of Community Development Action Plan grants. I did speak to Rep. Mettler to get an idea on the bill, and I must say that I am opposed to the concept of the program of CDAP, is complicated enough with the red tape that we do have, and to establish three more different categories of CDAP, I think would just compound the problem, in order to receive state or federal funding. As it is now, we have one CDAP plan that has not worked out well. To add two more to it, a Plan A and Plan B, and a Plan C, would just confuse the people in the state even more, and add more paper work and more red tape which is just the thing we are trying not to do. So I don't think that this would solve anything at all, and I do feel that it would be a bad bill. Thank you.

Rep. Orcutt, 100th District: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I'd just like to indicate to you that I have in the Legislative Commissioner's Office a bill on CDAP being drafted which provides that the CDAP process be an optional one for municipalities and that it would not be a pre-requisite for any state funds. This bill will be finalized, and I've been consulting with Commissioner Dorsey on this matter, and we hope that this bill will be finalized within the next week, and then I hope that we'll have an opportunity to have a hearing on that bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. Douglas A. Beals, Chairman, CDAP Housing Committee, Bristol: Gentlemen, I wonder if we're specifically limited to these bills that are immediately here, or may I talk a little bit about CDAP in general?

Rep. Tudan: To the CDAP program as such, fine. This is CDAP day, sir.

Mr. Beals: All right. Fine. I have a paper prepared which I think might be of some value or interest to you. If you bear with me, it pertains to several facets of CDAPing as such.

Rep. Tudan: You'll skim through it, I hope.

Mr. Beals: I'll do my best, sir. I know what your problem is. First of all, I know that we're talking in terms of re-organization of DCA, for one thing, but specifically, expediting funding through DCA, through the CDAPing type programs, leaves us in pretty much of a bag as far as area, or what we would call regional or state-wide programs are concerned. I think that you're all aware of the fact that there is no way possible presently for any DCA funds to be given for regional or state-wide programs, and there are many instances here in Connecticut where regional and state-wide programs are quite important. I think in terms of a program which I personally operate, which is a program of friendly visitation in

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

the greater Hartford area. By the graces of Hartford CDAP, I operate in a 29-town area, through CRT's funding, as Roy Jones knows. I think in terms of child day care centers. I think in terms of mass transportation for elderly other than on bus lines, and on furnishing prescription drugs to the elderly from a drug prescription center in a community. I've been working in the field of aging for close to thirty years. I'm chairman of a coordinating council which represents about 130,000 of the 280,000 seniors in the state. I realize some of the problems which they have, and what I would suggest to you people, to make this brief, inasmuch as this is not DCA day and reorganization, etc, is that I'd like to suggest to you that, in your consideration of CDAP, and perhaps later I would hope to appear before the same group again, I guess when you talk about DCA, is the possibility of making DCA funds available directly to qualified organizations or agencies other than through CDAP programs, so that you can do regional and state-wide programming which is so essential, and I take my own program for example. I happen to run a program called Breakthrough to the Aging which is the largest direct repetitive service program to the elderly in the state of Connecticut, and this includes senior centers and everybody. It's being now publicized nationally as being the best organized volunteer program in the country. This is last Thursday we received word from Washington, the National Center for Volunteer Action, that we've been selected out of over a thousand programs they've reviewed. They will tell about this to their 3,000 member organizations. We use the services of over 400 volunteers in the Greater Hartford area to do home, phone, and convalescent home visitation to over 1500 elderly people. Now, unless something can be done, to continue a program such as this, or to provide direct service to child day care centers so that they don't have to clear through CDAP programs, I think you know as well as I do that there are only about 17 towns that have completed CDAP programs. In effect, Bristol is at the point where they're getting close to making their presentation for the 5-year plan. And you can get a few funds, but many towns won't accept CDAPing, and, as a result, I ask that you consider opening this up to the extent that you can get direct service funds from DCA without CDAPing. I think that's the essence of my point. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Leroy Jones, Development Administrator, New Haven: Gentlemen, I'm kind of happy to be here to have a chance to speak perhaps from a different level, and I might add from sometimes a little more strict and stringent level than heretofore, so we can chat a little bit about some of the problems with CDAP, and there are probably many. First, I would say out of hand that I feel strongly that 5494 or any other bill would be designed to take off the mandatory nature of CDAP. Before grants are made from

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

DCA, there would be an irresponsible act, and I think we'd have to review that by the legislature. You're breaking faith with the towns and the cities who have, in good faith, and under the statute, gone forward with this program. And you're breaking faith with, I would suggest, over 7500 or 8,000 citizens who spent a lot of time, time that they could have spent on other matters working in their municipalities, and trying to determine what was the proper goals, what were the proper priorities, what they thought their municipalities ought to be; and, you know, I've been considerably worried about that over a period of time because many of these people have done this from very strong motivation, feeling that this was their new way of participating with their municipalities, even though they were not elected officials. It gave an opportunity and made many of the central cities for minority groups to participate much more fully than they had before, so I just hate to see it breaking faith there. Secondly, I think it would be irresponsible in a period when budget stringencies have to be talked about. Strong budget stringencies have to be observed, and there is a desperate need for the establishment of priorities. The CDAP process was designed primarily so that municipalities themselves could begin to set their own priorities, and reflect those in state concerns. It was an attempt to let them be on with the priority setting without the state coming down and saying this shall be thy priority. And I think that that is very important. Thirdly, I think it would be irresponsible because it would be going in a different direction than the federal government is going presently. In talking with the federal officials, we find that the 701 type of planning, and I presume that is what Rep. Rose refers to in his act here, is going to take much more the tanner of being a plan-management type of document. Shorter planning, more address to action, but addressed also to the management side of municipal matters. If we're going to move down the road to revenue sharing, you know one of the criticisms is in revenue sharing is that municipalities, and even states, won't know what to do with the money, or won't do it properly. I can see Wilbur Mills saying, just give it to the cities, and they'll spend it for the wrong thing. If there is then, and if the state is to have some say as to what that management approach is going to be, and the municipalities, and I suggest CDAP at least offers one of the ways. I won't go too far in that because I know that there's a great deal of problems there. There is a report - I don't know whether it's fully published now - done by the American Society of Planning Officials, in which they have been asked to look at what CDAP meant to the municipalities, and as I understood it, one of the very strong recommendations was that the mandatory nature of CDAP be kept in the legislation, if in fact this was to be a way of helping strengthen local government, local competence,

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

and the local ability to handle these many problems. I think it's rather good evidence, and I think it's good authority for this type of approach by an agency that is nationwide and has been looking at these matters throughout the whole United States. Well, I won't go on longer. I dare say that in my occupation I can do that, but I certainly appreciate the chance to chat with you a little bit about it. I feel very strongly about certain aspects and will welcome any questions. Thank you.

Sen. Lieberman: Commissioner, ex-Commissioner, excuse me, Mr. D.A. You know, I'm learning the political way. There are people around that I'm supposed to call Judge who were judges 20 years ago, so there's no reason why I can't call you Commissioner.

Mr. Jones: No, but it's a little dangerous when you get an incumbent.

Sen. Lieberman: I have one question myself, and that relates to the bill introduced by Rep. Mettler and the concept that I guess is implied there, which is that we might do well to establish different categories of CDAP for different size towns. I wonder how you feel about that?

Mr. Jones: I think it is certainly worth looking at. We were troubled during my stay in the department about the fact that in one case the CDAP format may seem overly complicated for a smaller community, and may be too simplified for a larger one, and even vice versa, and I suggest to you that the vice versa is the case. Now being at city level, I can tell you how ramified twelve functions get to be to really look at in detail. However, administratively, the Department tried very hard to allow for a difference in grain. Sherman completed their CDAP while I was in office and did a reasonably good job of it, but in very broad grain. We were talking about 1200 people there. Now you're going to be seeing documents from Bridgeport and from Hartford and New Haven which have to be a great deal more complex. So I don't know that I have a clean-cut answer as to how you change this thing. Administratively, I think it's the best opportunity. However, I don't believe in just deleting functions. Remember, there's twelve functions said that you must look at in the act. I don't believe that just by deleting functions you're going to help it a whole lot. Maybe in the depth in which they're looked, maybe in the job of marshalling the resources and some of these other worries, you could look for some help there under 5771, but I don't have a very good answer, and we did worry about this. But I do, and I think some of the Committee members who have looked at some of the CDAPs realize, that, in terms of a Sherman or in terms of a more rural community, the grain in looking at this matter is totally different

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

than it is when you get down to a large city, and has to be, and it may be that that's the best way to handle it.

Sen. Lieberman: I have one more question myself, and then I'll give someone else a shot at it. I'm intrigued by the notion that you put forward of CDAP serving as a basis for making decisions on priorities in a time of limited resources. I wonder -- well, two parts of it -- one, whether the completed CDAP's that you've seen would lend themselves to that kind of application; and two, would you establish any formal mechanism for having CDAP be the guide to priorities in funding, either on a local level, or in terms of DCA aid to the localities?

Mr. Jones: I think that at least I have seen did, to answer the question, in fact I recall a number of occasions where we almost had to refer the CDAP back and say "Be honest and state your priority", because everything in the book had the highest priority sometimes, and that really isn't quite the way at getting at the priority setting, and my own city has some problems in that respect too, I might add. But the truth of the matter is yes, they would begin to cope with it, and say this is a priority matter. It might not necessarily be a matter to call for money. I remember some of the smaller CDAP's called for actions by their own legislative body which didn't cost money but did make a change. So the answer is yes, that this can be, I think, an effective mechanism. The second part is how you make an effective part of setting a state priority and so on. I think this august body at the time of the last session did direct the commissioner to come in with a so-called allocation plan, whereby the General Assembly could get good information about what the needs of the municipalities were, what their priorities were. It is my understanding that Commissioner Dorsey did send to the General Assembly a plan for allocation and getting information, which is what you really need. What is the companion information that comes out of the CDAP, how is it matched with other indicators? Because you've got indicators of how many people stay, why they're in delapidated housing. How many people are below the poverty line? How many people have health problems? And so on like this, so that this information base could be put together and could be made available to legislators so they could make rational decisions in terms of state priorities. And the mechanism has been recommended, and I'll be glad to remind that I think the message was transmitted to the Speaker and to the President pro-tem, and if that hasn't been made available to the Committee, it should be.

Sen. Lieberman: Any other questions?

No name given: I was listening to President Nixon, and as I

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

listened to him I kind of got ideas, I said somehow or other I hear certain things that former Commissioner Jones spoke to us about in Connecticut. Now my question to you would be, has the federal government in fact contacted your former department, and have they gotten any ideas from our state of Connecticut in the past three or four years as to what to do in the various communities and towns?

Mr. Jones: I assume you didn't mean you felt I was talking with President Nixon. I wanted to clear that up. This is true. In all fairness the Department of Housing and Urban Development has already had a team looking at one or two of the towns as to the process they followed in doing their CDAP. In talking to Dick Nathan who is in the Office of Management and Budget there recently in Washington, he indicated that they kind of wanted to move in this route. I don't think they would call it CDAP. I think that is a patented name in Connecticut, and there may be a very good reason why he doesn't want to. But, anyway, I think they're moving in the direction of the idea that the state government and probably federal government has some responsibility to build the competence, build the planning and action process of its municipalities, and in that respect, yes, we're beginning to move in that direction, and I think it truly is without a particular partisan stripe to it. I think that they realize that there is going to have to be greater decentralization of many of these action programs if they're going to work; that's going to happen, what's the competence, the ability of a municipality to do it, what are their priorities, and what's the process in setting those priorities? Has it been a reasonably democratic process, small d, in setting the priorities, and I think this is part of it. So, I would be a little grandiose if I claimed that he was plagiarizing our material.

Sen. Lieberman: Representative Gudelski?

Rep. Gudelski, 110th District: Mr. Jones, one of the things I'm concerned about as far as CDAP is concerned is over the years, at least it has been my experience, public or citizen interest in government has been very apathetic. The concept of CDAP has evidently aroused the public from their slumber. I'm very much interested in your opinion of what exactly has CDAP accomplished in this area, citizen participation, and also how would this tie in with the federal trend insofar as that particular subject is concerned.

Mr. Jones: On the first item, I think we had documented prior to my leaving the department - I'm sure that any member of the DCA could make it more definitive - in the neighborhood of 7 - 8,000 citizens in the state of Connecticut

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

have been involved in the task force works and in the work that has come to setting the CDAP, so that I believe that there was a new.....and I might add it wasn't always on the pleasant side either. There were a lot of people involved who felt this was a stupid process and that the DCA wasn't much smarter for having put it on, so that it caused its own abrasions the other way around and should. I don't think that DCA was on mission in this thing, and I strongly believe that there is a good tempering in the process that is in order. Now as to the federal side of the thing, this is one of the issues that Nathan was worried about the other day. Remember, in the Model Cities Program, they talked about vast participation by citizens. Now, at some points that became so vast it became chaotic, and the question is, you know, how do you make this work within some sort of structures. On the other hand, they do admit that there's got to be greater participation by the average citizen, or there's going to be both a neglect of, and a disrespect for, local government. And this, I think, from the federal people is a great danger. Are people going to be frustrated to the extent that they say "we just can't feel a part of, or local government is irresponsible to us", and if that occurs, we are in real trouble. I won't comment about restructuring town councils or anything like that to make it more representative, but that might be part of the action, too.

Rep. Edwards, 155 Mr. Jones, you, I believe, mentioned there that support of this bill would be breaking faith with people, and these people were not elected. I wonder if you could explain that. In other words, the purpose of this bill is to try and, to a certain extent, be a more direct route to the money to the people who are elected in their communities, responsible for those who feel themselves I won't say right or wrong, but who feel themselves that they are the ones who the public has put their faith in, not with people that they don't seem to know. We've had that problem in Stamford. That problem exists in Stamford, where CDAP has not, you know, been particularly popular, and where the opinion of the citizens is that the CDAP itself is a little bit of a break of faith with the electorate, and it has resulted, I would say, with a smaller participation in some of the things that the community does need and that I know the program would call for, than we should have.

Mr. Jones: You know, we had a particular problem in Stamford. There the mayor declared himself to be the CDAP agency, and this resulted in a real kind of distortion of the whole matter. I don't take issue one way or the other. You could do it under the Act, but I'm afraid that began to be the problem you're talking about where people were saying who were these self-anointed citizens who were going to help say what was the rule. So I think you have a particular problem in Stamford that should

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

be addressed and was addressed to by the General Assembly in '69 when they said that you can't do that anymore - you have to have a board of five or fifteen members nominated by the Chief Executive Officer, and then of course approved by the legislative body, which would be your board of representatives, which gave it another dimension. But that agency was to be hopefully reasonably representative of the group at large. Now the constituency of Stamford..... at large. If the legislative body had the real right, in the last analysis, to kind of determine who was going to be on it, that would seem to be quite responsive to the democratic process of electing the people there. Now, is this what you're worrying about on that end of it? You said I said break the faith, and I meant this -- in many municipalities, they were, let's be very frank, strongly encouraged to go into this because they felt there was some state grant money at the end of the line, and, you know, with all due respect to Rep. Rose's bill, this would make a change of venue very rapidly in that type of thing very rapidly. Now, we've always said in the department that we hoped that CDAP stood on its own feet as a planning and management tool, without having to be just thought of as a ticket to the goodies at the end of the line, but I don't think that we'd be realistic if we didn't realize that municipalities were looking down the road to this being the device to getting some of that money.

Rep. Edwards: One other statement -- under resources available to the smaller community, I believe there is another program which provides this, now proposed?

Mr. Jones: In DCA?

Rep. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Jones: Wait a minute, maybe you are thinking -- we're in the land of letters over there -- CPAP program, the committee of Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program, and there is a matter of technical assistance made available to municipalities without regard to CDAP or anything else, and if they need help in making up an application or if they need help in a zoning or planning problem, or with engineering problems, or measurement problems, yes, there should be somebody else -- that's very true. That program is ongoing, and has been for about the last year and a half.

Rep. Edwards: So, if this were to evolve as direct benefit, the community would still have access to technical resources.

Mr. Jones: Oh, yes, certainly. There's never been any question about that. They have the right to call upon -- you're right, it should be made very clear that the communities

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

have a right -- any community, CDAP or otherwise, has a right to call upon the Department for technical assistance, and this has been one of the problems. I have to admit to you on that one that too often there was a feeling in the community that they couldn't call on the state because of these problems.

Rep. Blumenthal, 56th District: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jones -- I still would prefer calling you Commissioner, though. Two problems I've seen with CDAP is No. 1 -- in this hiatus period where some towns were contemplating going into CDAP don't know what this legislature is going to do, and where this is such a time lag, and the time-table for preparing a CDAP for small communities -- I'm from eastern Connecticut, and we have primarily small communities out there -- is such that if say (and I happen to be planning commission) we want to update our master plan, why, we have to go through a CDAP when we know we must update our master plan, we know it's an essential planning tool, we know that if we have a CDAP it's going to take a year or two years, they're going to come up and say update your master plan. Why we have to go through all of the functions of the CDAP, or why we can't get started on the master plan and let CDAP go along with it. In other words, I think Rep. Rose isn't saying to do away with CDAP -- he's saying do away with it as a requirement for getting federal or state funding, and the other problem that I've seen is that we have several things on a regional approach where we have, say, a legal aid service, or we have a community action program that serves 15 or 20 towns. They, before they can prepare their budget, have to go and get 15 to 20 CDAP approvals. Then, when several of the CDAP's disapprove them, they have to pro-rate out their funds. Now, I'm sure you are aware of a couple of in eastern Connecticut that are presently getting funding for the year 1970 because of this problem, and I just wonder how you speak to those problems and how we can somehow simplify this thing.

Mr. Jones: Let me speak to your last one first because you, and Mr. Beals reflected on that a minute ago, and a very good reflection, because one of the things that CDAP has not yet adequately coped with is how you handle the regional situation. You have a number of agencies, regional agencies, in eastern Connecticut and some other places, and you almost get in a position of one CDAP agency that doesn't approve holding the whole show up, and we toyed with that at one point and said maybe for certain types of programs, and, boy, I don't want to get you all strung out on this one, but for maybe human resource development programs, and maybe regional CDAP should suffice, rather than have to -- I'd better leave it there because we'll get into an awful lot of technical garbage there. We probably shouldn't. On the other point, on the updating of the master plan -- you see,

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

this goes to the real issue we had at the time CDAP was evolved. What was a master plan? And a master plan in the average public's minds was one thing, and that was the land use plan, and traffic and circulation, and maybe a little capital improvement budgeting. That was planning. Planning did not have to involve the social problems. It didn't have to involve a health plan. It didn't have to involve some of the other things - cultural plans - some of the other things that were put into the CDAP. So, I'd be less than honest to say, when I say we didn't say let's begin to look realistically at what we call the master plan. And we're not going to get rid of the term "master plan" just like that, because it's ingrained, it's latched into the statute to some extent; at least a comprehensive plan of development is there, and that means primarily a land use plan. We, in the department, had always attempted to allow sufficient monies and flexibilities so that part of the CDAP process would be the up-dating of the master plan. I think that is occurring in almost 50 or 60% of the municipalities doing CDAP. They're using part of that money to really update the master plan, and I think it's a reasonable thing to do. But I just believe strongly, and I think this Committee must consider that, whether we're going to just continue to make planning..... in this narrow context of land use, and traffic and circulation. Doesn't it importantly have these other aspects, and it shouldn't be a way of holding back. In fact, in many areas it has been a way of facilitating updating the master plan.

Rep. Orcutt, 100th District: Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Former Commissioner, Roy, on CDAP, you know I've had a few problems with CDAP. You know that I haven't opposed it as a voluntary local effort, and I think it has some value locally, and I've stated this publicly on a number of occasions, but there are some problems that always have disturbed me about CDAP. No. 1 is that you're requiring towns to do something that in many cases they don't want to do in order to get money, and to me an effort along that line is bound to be counter-productive in most instances. Also, I think that by making CDAP voluntary this will strengthen those CDAP's that are in existence in these communities that desire to continue. I think it will make it a much stronger product, but the point that we're at now is 75% of the state's population or something like that is being covered by CDAP, and will be covered by completed CDAP's here in a matter of a month or a year. So our real question in my mind is where do we go from here, and I think that we'll strengthen CDAP a great deal by saying that in the subsequent phases after the initial plan is developed, it should be done on a voluntary basis. It will not be a prerequisite for state funding. One of the big problems that I've seen on state funding on the prerequisite part is that that sort of dictates what your priorities are going to

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

be. You're going to put up there a

Rep. Tudan: Representative Orcutt, do you have a question?

Rep. Orcutt: I'm getting to it, Mr. Chairman, slowly..... what the priorities are going to be, but what do you think CDAP - how are we going to regularize this process from now on, in those communities that have an established plan? Are we going to design the CDAP agency so that - or the CDAP function - so that it meshes in with local government? I think that these are the problems that we ought to talk to.

Mr. Jones: Yes, I think your latter statement of the problem is a reasonable question. Before I had left the department, we had gone into a number of communities a so-called continuing phase of CDAP. The legislation provides, of course, that CDAP must be updated every two years, and to continue the eligibility of the municipality for funding. So the feeling of the administration at that point was that there had to be some regular on-going agency, ~~some~~ local competence, working at this matter of updating it, and thus the state had some responsibility to continue to support that effort. I suppose we find ourselves in disagreement on the first of your premises that if it's a voluntary thing, it's a better CDAP, and the ASPO report, again I refer to the American Society of Planning Officials, is very strong in stating that this was an important assertion of state government's concern, as to how its municipalities were being organized, how they were ordering their lives and their priorities. You know, it's a question of how much the state dictates and doesn't dictate, and how much is left to the local municipalities, and it's a neat art to work up where these lines lie. Now, the thought in back of the CDAP was that this was one way in which the state could designate the planning that had to be done. You know, this isn't all that new in a concept. The workable program concept on the federal government was a requirement for renewal and housing and a whole series of things, which is being eroded, incidentally, but from the federal side, because that prevented the suburbs from getting low income housing, which is an interesting change of events there. But as to the on-going part of the thing, I think the Committee has some things to consider, too. How do you rationalize a CDAP agency with a local planning commissioner? This is an area where we're got to think about it. The planning commissioners do consider themselves pretty much concerned with conventional type planning. That means land use planning, capital budgeting, and so on, and except those that have become CDAP agencies - and some of them are kind of worried how they ever got into that bag. So it's one that you have to work with. Again I come back to the fact that

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

unless planning has this larger context, not just what we've known as the conventional traditional planning, but the broader one bringing in many of the social aspects, the health aspects, the communication aspects, and so forth, that we've really not done the planning job as far as the state is concerned. I think one thing has got to be made clear, though. This was designed also and I hope there are some people here who can testify today that the CDAP was designed to strengthen the hand of the local chief elected official; to improve his competence is almost an alter ego by what we call CDAP coordinators and so on. And I can't think of a better funding thing for the state to continue than to try to help strengthen that competence. Many of our elected officials don't have the time. They have to serve part-time, and this has been the difference in many cases of being able to have somebody who is there all the time concerned about these problems, and not having it. And for that reason I also say it's a management tool in a continuing basis, and ought to be so considered. I don't know if that answered your question, Bob.

Rep. Tudan: Is there anything new that you folks would care to ask? Representative Hogan?

Rep. Hogan, 177th District: Roy, you said that we might be breaking the faith with some 8,000 people if we did anything to CDAP. These 8,000 people have got involved in the town affairs. Now, I wonder, over a four-year period, have they done anything? Have they got their work done? If they've got their work done, then we're not breaking faith with them.

Mr. Jones: Yes, but you've got to understand why they did the work, some of them. They did the work because this was going to be, you know, a pre-requisite in many cases to being able to get grants for, say, an industrial park development, or day care, or whatever it might well be. Again I see that I'm putting myself in an intolerable position, because on one hand I'm telling you that CDAP is a good thing to do as a management tool, and then I'm turning around and saying a lot of communities did it because they wanted to get the grants at the end of the line. But I think we're being realistic in recognizing this. If they worked hard, and in the end the department was out there, and the selectman was out there saying, look - this was an important thing to do, not only for its management and action planning basis, but as a fact that we do want to get some neighborhood facilities, or whatever the grant may well be down the road, and this is part of the requirement to do it, then I think that they worked under a false premise, if the legislature now says you didn't have to do that after all. That's to me breaking faith. Maybe that's a little strong word for you. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Rep. Tudan: Anyone else care to come forward?

Mr. Reagan Burkeholder, CDAP Coordinator, Norwich: I might note to the Committee that we are one of the communities in the state that has completed its first round CDAP. We completed the local action on August 3rd of last year, and DCA acting very quickly had approved the plan within three weeks. I'd like to speak briefly about the legislation that is under consideration here today, first concerning using federal planning, or removing the requirement of CDAP for federal planning assistance. I would suggest to you the possibility of allowing the Department of Community Affairs to assist in its one-half non-federal share programs, that is programs for which money is available from the federal government, and towards which the state contributed half of the necessary local share, to allow the Department to distribute those funds to communities that do not have a CDAP and do not intend to have a CDAP in order for them to get this money for which CDAP is not a pre-requisite. However, I would suggest both on my own behalf and on behalf of my CDAP agency that CDAP be retained as a pre-requisite for state programs with one condition that I will discuss in a moment. Concerning providing in the legislation for a variety of CDAP programs based on the size of the community, I would suggest here that the existing legislation is broad enough to allow the community of Sherman, and the community of New Haven, the community of Sprague, and the community of Norwich, to operate a successful CDAP program, and, if there has been a fault, it has been in interpretation. I believe the fault may be in lower management or middle management officials of DCA who have gone out into the community armed with the CDAP guide which was prepared, and that is a detailed heavy fearsome instrument, and it specifies how this shall be done. Norwich did not abide by this CDAP guide, yet we have an approved program. I think that in some cases the Department's municipal services coordinators have gone out, especially to small towns. They have exhibited this book this thick, and said this is how you will do a CDAP. You will establish goals, you will establish objectives, you will discuss programs and needs and problems. And it appears to be a very formalized thing, that on January 1st you'll have this done, and on January 3rd you'll have this, and by April 1st this will be done, and May 2nd this will be done. Whereas CDAP does not have to operate that way. The CDAP can operate very simply with a group of citizens - I believe Sherman had 20 people involved. Out of 1200 people, that seems a good number. They come together; they discuss the problems of the community; they discuss programs to alleviate those problems. If there is a formal requirement for setting down a goal, you can take a look at the programs and say what goal does this reach, and is that a reasonable goal. You don't have to

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

communities, is facing a grave fiscal situation, and I believe an additional \$40,000 a year, an additional \$80,000 an additional \$120,000 year, to be used for strictly for implementation of the CDAP and the CDAP's recommendations could be a quite valuable tool to the community, and would, as a matter of fact, be a great incentive towards completion and continuation of the CDAP program, whether at state expense or local expense. Thank you.

Rep. Kaplik, 22nd District: I'd like to ask a question. You indicated you felt that for those communities that did not have and, as you put it, did not intend to have a CDAP, such federal programs and funds be channelled through DCA. Is it your opinion that these towns were thinking more theoretically, because we don't know which towns you're talking about, that towns as such that don't have a CDAP are incompetent to handle their own affairs.

Mr. Burkeholder: I was not suggesting that the funds be channelled through DCA. I'm suggesting, for instance, that a federal housing code enforcement program, for instance -- a community can apply for federal housing code enforcement program, and, supposing it is granted, it is either a 2/3's or 75% grant. Supposing it is a 75% grant, it may then apply to the Department of Community Affairs for one-half of the non-federal share. There are two completely divorced applications, and I would say that in a case where a community has federal funds available to it for which CDAP is not a pre-requisite, that the pre-requisite should not be necessary for the state funds, and that the state turn those funds over. But I'm not suggesting that the federal funds go through the Department of Community Affairs. Thank you.

Mr. William Hickey, CDAP Administrator, New Britain: I represent the CDAP Association of Connecticut, of which I am the president. We've just completed a meeting in which there was general agreement on the position that we probably should take. At the same time, there were several areas where there was disagreement. However, many of the coordinators came over to the Capitol to make themselves available to you after the regular session to discuss this possible difference between the agreements and disagreements. As a general statement, there was certainly a need expressed by previous legislatures that the local communities needed some inducement to examine their local plans and programs as they are related to the various boards and commissions. At the same time, the development of the community required a broad segment of participation. Now these are, I guess, the backbone of the Community Development Act as far as the CDAP is concerned, and it's a little early

set the goal and do this. I think the administrative structure exists to tailor the CDAP program as the legislation is written to the individual municipality. Now, as for the requirements that there be a CDAP, or a program for the preparation of a CDAP, as a pre-requisite for state funding through the Department of Community Affairs, I would suggest that this be removed, this requirement be removed, in one case, and that is where there is a regional agency operating. In southeastern Connecticut, we have the Thames Valley Council for Community Action as an umbrella. In the city of Norwich we have the Child and Family Development program as a local delegate anti-poverty agency. The members of the CDAP agency in Norwich feel that both the board of the Child and Family Development Program, and the board of the Thames Valley Council for Community Action, is far more representative of the needs of the community as a whole, and of the region as a whole, than the members of the CDAP agency are. They do not feel that they have the competence to judge regional programs that are submitted by TVCCA. They are interested in judging local programs that are submitted through TVCCA by the local delegate agency. But if a program is to affect Groton and New London and Preston and Montville and Voluntown and Griswold and Sprague and Franklin, the Norwich CDAP agency does not wish to be put in the position of saying well, we really don't like this program, and therefore we are not going to approve it. So I would suggest that regional programs be funded without the pre-requisite of a CDAP. Finally, I would like to suggest one possible implementation step for the CDAP. We have discussed the setting of priorities locally. Roy Jones has discussed the problem of what happens to the CDAP after it has been adopted. I would suggest to you one possibility would be that the state legislature authorize lock grants based on population to communities that have completed CDAP's, the one stipulation on the awarding of the grant being that it be used for implementation of programs specifically mentioned in the CDAP. In Norwich, for instance, we have come up with about 250 pages of detailed programs. So far most of them have been administrative because it was finished in the middle of the fiscal year and we knew the money would not be available. So we scheduled administrative programs. So far we are hitting about 75% completion from the period September 1, 1970 to the present. So we have been successful in our implementation. However, we are now getting to the point beginning the first of July, the new fiscal year, where implementation of these programs is going to require money, and for many of these programs there are no categorical grants through the state or federal governments, whether they be for housing site development or the safe streets act. There are no categorical grants available, and Norwich, like so many other

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

in the game to determine just what the effectiveness of these two basic elements are, unless there is a complete analysis of those CDAP documents as they come in. I think there are nine or ten that are completed, some covering the major cities and some some very small communities. There would be indicative, perhaps, of what may be done in legislative enactment or changes or modifications to redesign the legislation to agree with what has happened in the communities. The main point is that, in addition to the 8,000 that were mentioned, one coordinator did a paper for a master's program in which there some 11,000 plus people had been involved in this process of developing the CDAP itself. We will be available until such time as you wish to call on us.

Rep. Kaplik, 22nd District: There's been..... and you and others have mentioned the number of people involved in CDAP, and I'm wondering if you know of any figures available, perhaps Mr. Jones or anyone else in the room, or the percentage of turnover of these people. For instance, in the CDAP that I was involved in, frankly we had good participation, but in a 18-month period, the turnover was significant, and the sheer numbers doesn't impress me, unless the sheer numbers could indicate that people were disgusted with it and quit. I'd like to have some idea from you or from somewhere else the turnover of these participants in CDAP. Is there anything available, sir?

Mr. Hickey: Not to my knowledge. This paper that I speak of was prepared on the basis that a new program, and what was the involvement within the state. I don't believe it went into that depth but I could find out for you.

Rep. Kaplik: I, and I think others on the Committee, would appreciate knowing the rate of turnover in the number of CDAP volunteer participants.

Rep. DiMeo, 98th District: How long have you had CDAP in New Britain?

Mr. Hickey: Slightly over two years. Our program was extended.

Rep. DiMeo: Do you have a completed plan as yet?

Mr. Hickey: We are in the process of presenting a completed plan to the Common Council.

Rep. DiMeo: At what state are you in process?

Mr. Hickey: It's in draft, final draft status.

Rep. DiMeo: When do you anticipate it being completed?

Mr. Hickey: During the month of March.

18
RM

WEDNESDAY STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Rep. DiMeo: Do you have any figures as to what its cost to this point to produce this plan?

Mr. Hickey: No, but it would be in the neighborhood of our original grant which was \$200,000.

Rep. DiMeo: I'm sure in your plan you have some specific recommendations as to order of priority for funding. Are there funds available now to implement these programs?

Mr. Hickey: There are in some cases. Not all the recommendations require funding. Several are administrative. Some are requesting legislative changes on the part of the Common Council.

Rep. DiMeo: What is the population of New Britain?

Mr. Hickey: 85,000.

Rep. DiMeo: 85 --- you, in New Britain, also have a police commission, a fire commission?

Mr. Hickey: Yes, we do.

Rep. DiMeo: A recreation commission?

Mr. Hickey: Yes.

Rep. DiMeo: Board of education?

Mr. Hickey: Yes.

Rep. DiMeo: Planning and zoning commission, zoning board of appeals?

Mr. Hickey: Yes.

Rep. DiMeo: Health board, etc.?

Mr. Hickey: Yes.

Rep. DiMeo: In your opinion, in your situation in New Britain have you found that 1) are you covering the same ground as these commissions?

Mr. Hickey: To a certain degree, we have relied upon them, mostly the chairmen of the various commissions who constitute our CDAP agency in New Britain, and they are making inputs from their own departments or boards.

Rep. DiMeo: Have you found that there is any friction between the commissions and CDAP?

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Mr. Hickey: No, there's been areas of conflict between different individuals, but not to any degree in the committee itself. There are 12 members to the committee.

Rep. DiMeo: Do you think that, in your particular instance, with New Britain being a medium-sized city, that the solutions to the various problems, at least the arrival at the recognition of a problem, cannot be taken care of by the standing commissions and boards that we have had in the past?

Mr. Hickey: Well, I can speak to the result. The other would be conjecture. Yes, they did go much further beyond what they normally would do in the course of a year. First of all, and I say it for this reason - that we, as an agency, or a staff on the agency, presented specific questions to all the agencies and the boards and commissions to answer. Some were related to standards of performance, others to needs, what were the problems within their departments, and we found in some cases that there were mutual problems that again could be solved through legislation, through reorganization, and streamlining of the local government. Now, whether or not this takes place is depending upon the implementation portion of the CDAP, which is the second two-year period.

Rep. DiMeo: I'll give you an observation, and either you or anyone from CDAP can answer it, in that the question has been raised already as to numbers involved in CDAP. In every community with these boards and commissions, it has been my experience to find that these people involved in these boards and commissions, for them not to attend one of their meetings - this has been my own personal experience in a community just a little smaller than yours - that, for them not to attend one of their hearings, or one of their regular sessions, would virtually mean that they were completely incapacitated and couldn't even be carried there, and there is a very visible, from where I sit, very visible turnover in the people active in CDAP in the different groups. And it appears, looking from one end, that CDAP activities, investigative activities, are duplicating the efforts of all of the boards and commissions that a community normally has. Now I look at CDAP, if it is going to remain as something that could orchestrate the different departments, because it is true that as an administrative assistive arm of the mayor and of the council, quite often community problems get to be larger than what they can themselves coordinate, and that possibly CDAP should be considered merely as a cooperative organization or a function within the town or city which coordinates the activities of these already existing boards, because boards and commissions are created by statute, and have power within themselves to initiate action, where CDAP committees do not. It always seems

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

strange to me, and your community is not unusual, that we would expend hundreds of thousands of dollars to investigate problems, and then after we've investigated the problems, have no funding to clear them up. The question of that is, instead of breaking faith with the people, aren't we creating, by the system that we have now, aren't we creating in the minds of the people when it is first initiated, the fact that here might possibly be a solution, and then after almost two years of almost duplicate activity find that we don't have the solutions or the fundings; what solutions we do have, we have no funding for, and therefore creating in a large segment..

Rep. Tudan: Sir, do you have a question to ask? Well, give Mr. Hickey the question.

Rep. DiMeo: Yes, the question is, aren't we creating in the minds of the people, in a large segment of the people, a distrust in government because we cannot produce what we say what we intend to produce in the beginning.

Rep. Tudan: Mr. Hickey, would you answer that yes or no, please.

Mr. Hickey: No, I don't think so.

Rep. Tudan: That's fine. No is enough. Senator DeNardis?

Sen. DeNardis, 34th District: Since you are the president of the CDAP coordinators association, I wonder if you and your association have given any thought to the matter of defining in some revision of the statute pertaining to CDAP, and in particular to the role of the coordinator, the qualifications that a coordinator might bring to the job. I know it's difficult to establish a litany of qualifications that the person should bring to such a position, but, as it stands now, the statute just makes reference to the role of coordinator per se without even minimally speaking to the question of what talent or qualifications the coordinator should have. Have you given any thought to that?

Mr. Hickey: The organization has not discussed this. We have ourselves informally, and, if I can, I'll speak for myself on this. I believe that the man should have intimate knowledge of municipal operations. He has to know how a municipality functions. The second qualification - he must be able to deal with people effectively. In most cases, what is being proposed by one special component of the CDAP is perhaps objected to by some other portion of the community. Those are the two main qualifications that I would see as a coordinator.

Rep. Tudan: Thank you. Tom, I hope you can make it real quick. There's a lot of people who want to testify here.

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Rep. Kaplik: Very factual -- in New Britain, could you tell us the number of people involved in CDAP and the percentage of turnover in your particular town of New Britain.

Mr. Hickey: No, I couldn't answer that accurately. I could tell you how many people were involved from the beginning, and that was in the neighborhood (these are private citizens), in the neighborhood of 600.

Rep. Tudan: We're not going to have a debating society here. There are a lot of people here that care to testify, and I wish that you folks that will appear and testify, if you have something new to hit on, if you want to get up and state your position yes and no. As for the members of the committee, if you have questions to ask, this is fine, but you must remember now your views and how you feel about it, certainly you can go at length with us in executive session in regards to this matter. So, if you have questions, make them direct, please, and not have your philosophy on the program. All right, sir.

Mr. Rick Sorenson, CDAP Coordinator, Groton: I say the town and city of Groton because we're an unconsolidated municipality, and because of that we have some unique problems that aren't encountered by many of the other communities in the state. One of the problems is that we have just about two of everything. We have two councils; we have two public works departments; all the way down the line, we have two of everything. And CDAP has proven extremely valuable to us by providing the most comprehensive way possible at looking at the problems encountered by the geographical entity of the town of Groton. We have throughout our program - we're at the six months' stage right now - and we have to this point approximately 90 people involved in the program. We have encouraged people to participate in the program on as extensive or as limited a basis as they wish. The reason for this is that some people may be interested in a housing code, or in a housing site development agency, or in working on the education committee to supplement the social services that are provided to people within our school system. We have encouraged people to work with us on those issues that they feel comfortable with, on those issues that they feel that they have something to contribute to the community. I feel very strongly that the requirement for a CDAP program should be maintained. I know from personal experience that, without the requirement that there be a CDAP program, the town and city of Groton would not have engaged in a CDAP. They engaged in it because it was a requirement for certain funds. Now that they have been involved, those private citizens that are involved, those elected officials and appointed officials within the town and city government who are involved see the merit of CDAP as a management tool. It is extremely valuable to us, and I suggest to the

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Committee that it can be extremely valuable to virtually any community. There is a great deal of flexibility in the program. We have not run into, and I don't foresee us running into, the mass of red tape that perhaps some other CDAP programs have run into .

Rep. Tudan: Sir, in other words, you're not critical of the program at all?

Mr. Sorenson: The only thing I would find fault with the program --

Rep. Tudan: That's what we want to know now.

Mr. Sorenson: --is that I think there is at the present time a requirement that the CDAP agency have a veto power over any programs going to the Department of Community Affairs, whether these programs be regional or local in origin. I feel that requirement for a veto power ought to be removed on regional programs. It should be maintained for local programs.

Mr. Vincent Richo, CDAP Coordinator, East Haven: These are my personal opinions, and I'll state my conclusion at the outset, and that is that the pre-requisite for CDAP ought to be eliminated from the legislation, or, at the very least, the legislation should be modified to permit the Department of Community Affairs to fund a program where a need can be demonstrated, at the very least. I will illustrate the point by saying that I don't think there are many local administrators who are critical of the program and the pre-requisite requirement who would, in fact, do in their local communities what they ask the state to do, and that is that, since they have the authority to levy taxes, I doubt very much that they would approve a departmental budget that gave them one figure for the entire department. I think they want a line item budget, and I think they want to know what's being done with those funds. They have a responsibility as an elected mayor to answer to the people as to how those monies will be used, and I think that on the other hand they're saying, you should give us money without asking us what we are going to do with it. Well, in fact, you, as the legislators here in Hartford, have a taxing responsibility. You're the one to take the money out of the taxpayer's pocket, and I think you have a right to expect that you will have some say as to how the funds that you take out of their pockets will be used. I think that there is a way of reconciling this, frankly, these two positions, and I think that the leverage, frankly at the beginning, at the 1967 session, when CDAP was first adopted, was there, but I think we've reached a point in time where approximately 77 or 78 or so communities are involved repre-

121

senting 80% of the population of this state. I think the question at this point as to whether or not it should be retained may be somewhat academic. Most people in the state of Connecticut living in towns and cities are involved in a CDAP process, and therefore it may not be critical. But I think there is one fundamental thing that the American people, especially people in Connecticut and New England resent, and that's being told that you must do something. I think that's been one of the onuses that's been placed on this program, and frankly I think it's hurt the program. If we can reason together, and we can provide the reasons why CDAP can be beneficial and useful, and then let a community come to the state and say, we need this kind of assistance, will you help us - I think that's far different from ramming it down their throats. And this has not been the case in the town of East Haven. Contrary to previous testimony, the town of East Haven would have applied for CDAP monies even though they were not seeking funds for other programs. They did not institute a CDAP program in order to get grants for other things, and the proof of it is that we haven't received grants for any other thing. We are just concluding our first year of CDAP. We honestly think in our opinion that, until we establish our goals and objectives, it would be very foolish for us to go off in different directions. We want to know more about what our real needs are; we want to know more about what our priorities are, and we want to put those in order before we come to the state and ask for money for a program that could very well be very low on our priority list. I think that's critical and crucial to the whole process. Now, if I may respond to the question of citizen participation, we have chosen a different route. Rather than asking the people to come to us, we have gone to them in our community, and we did it this way. We have generated what I think is excellent publicity through the press and through brochures that were distributed through the schools in our town. We have offered to come to people's homes in the community and to civic and fraternal organizations to discuss our program, and also, at those meetings, to give every citizen an opportunity to complete a general attitude questionnaire that deals with the 12 functions of CDAP. We have taken those questionnaires, and we are having them analyzed. We are having them computerized, and we are going to have a cross-section of opinion by individual neighborhoods and sub-neighborhoods in our community, and I think I'll conclude with that. Thank you.

Rep. Tudan: We've been hearing from nothing but coordinators of CDAP. We will continue to hear from them a little later, if we can have some members of the public and not officially associated with any CDAP program as such. Any of you folks care to come forward, why please feel

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

free to do so. Otherwise we'll go back to our coordinators. Anyone care to come forward, please do so.

Winifred Olson, Coordinator, Deep River: We are one of the towns that came primarily because there was a master plan need. CDAP was a sideline. They took it because they needed it in order to get master plan money. They're now finding out that they're gaining far more by taking a good look at themselves, and finding not only the weaknesses but that the town has far more strengths than they ever believed, and it's something the town needed to learn. They never had really analyzed themselves. This is one of the basic fundamental assets in small towns. They have the bad habit of sitting back and feeling they're small, and not really realizing how very strong they are. CDAP's doing that.

Rep. Tudan: Anyone else care to come forward?

Mr. Douglas Beals, Chairman, CDAP Housing Committee, Bristol: I want to heartily endorse the principal of CDAP. As chairman of the Housing Committee which I think most of you people realize is the most undesirable committee in the entire twelve, I've worked with this group nearly a year. Our turnover has been absolutely negligible. We had a seven member committee. We've had a loss because of a move out of town, and one loss because of a death. Beyond this, our committee remains intact. We have the redevelopment director; we have the chairman of our housing authority; we have a representative from the craft unions; we have myself just as a public member in this, and it's been very, very exciting. We have discovered things which we never knew about in our community, and the coordinated effort of all of these various committees has been excellent. We've had at our different meetings speakers coming in talking about high-rise apartments, federal housing, non-profit organizations, sectional homes under the possibility that Tom Sullivan's model mobile home park bill, which is part of a bill he's submitting for elderly housing in the state. We've discovered the geological and physical liabilities within our communities, of the areas which are left which can be developed, which no one has ever done except some of us who happen to be interested and concerned in the real estate. I've lived in the town all my life up till date, and I have known and have grown with the community, and it's been exciting. We've learned a number of things which we never realized or could ever put on paper. Working with our transportation committee, with the possibility of Route 72 going across from New Britain to Thomaston, where this would go across - the access, egress, routes going through our community. Things which we never would have done otherwise, and this is why I'm so excited about CDAP as a

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

method of causing things to happen and analyzing your own community. I know what we've learned. I didn't go into this for the possibility of getting money that might be received from the state, and I think many of other departments did not either. Our public works department is now in the process of taking a new look about housing and the restrictions. Our zoning commission, which is currently rezoning part of the community, is thinking in terms of the possibility - I don't like to use the word, but let's say mobile home parks - the model type, not the trailer parks that we all know. What do we do with the downtown redevelopment in Bristol, which for five years was a dustland, as many of you may know? It's becoming very exciting in this respect, and I can't speak too highly of CDAP and what it causes a community to do. So, I tried to answer your question, Representative Kablik, about the turnover and your comment on participation. Thank you.

Mr. Peter Burns, Coordinator of CDAP, Ansonia: I'd like to bring out one point that was mentioned earlier about regional planning agencies. I think the City of Ansonia, in the lower Naugatuck Valley, is the only area where you have regional planning and four CDAP's in the towns of Seymour, Ansonia, Derby, and Shelton, and the cooperation between the CDAP program and the regional planning agency has been something that's been unbelievable. Our cooperation has been excellent. We've eliminated duplication in the area of housing. Instead of four or five studies going on, we have one or a combination of programs. Another area that for fifteen years in our geographical area has been kicking around a health department. It's like a rocket. It's never got off the launch pad. In six months, the CDAP programs, in conjunction with the regional planning at Griffin Hospital and the Lower Naugatuck Valley Community Council, has prepared a plan - we didn't wait for our CDAP's to end; we know it's a necessity. We have prepared an outline for the four communities. The Boards of Aldermen from the three towns and Selectmen from Seymour have met. They've endorsed the plan. We've been able to form a council of government through the CDAP programs. I think the accomplishments of CDAP in the four towns of the Valley, as we call it, have been tremendous, and only with the cooperation of the CDAP's and the coordinators have we been able to accomplish the goals that we've established. We've introduced -- I believe legislation will be introduced in this General Assembly about forming a transit district. We have a geographical problem that we are just so close to each other. We've overcrowded conditions. We have no transportation, and I feel that a bill that will be introduced by the Senator from our area will also show another area that CDAP has really improved the living conditions of the Valley, and I would hope, you know, that this Committee would look into not just the overall program, but particular areas

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

as the Valley, and we would be willing at any time to meet with your Committee to discuss the CDAP program in Ansonia or the Valley, and also our coordination and working with the regional planning agency. Thank you.

Rep. Tudan: As a matter of information, once we adjourn, the Committee intends to meet with you folks. Mr. Hickey, are you aware of that?

Mr. John Somers, CDAP Coordinator, Newington: I've been the CDAP Coordinator in Newington for less than a year, and I'm bringing to you what I feel would be the voice of my citizens. There has been a turnover in Newington. We right now have about 100 citizens participating. However, at least 25-30 are new within the last few months, and you know why I feel the turnover exists. It's because of the continuous large amount of controversy and criticism that is in the newspaper daily about CDAP and about the Department of Community Affairs, and when one picks up the newspaper and he is volunteering two hours of his time each week, and these aren't little people. These are people who have executive positions, and they find out that the CDAP process is criticized, that there may not be money there when they get finished with their studies - what's the purpose of my coming to a meeting and sitting there for two hours? It's in vain. And that is to me the fault of CDAP and the fault of the Department of Community Affairs. It has not been said here tonight, but I wanted to say it. Thank you.

Rep. Bigos, 45th District: Can you tell from the newspaper articles who creates the criticism? That's the first question. The second part of it is - do you think that criticism is founded?

Mr. Somers: I wouldn't like to comment on where I think the criticism comes from. I think it's non-partisan. I think both parties have their own feelings about it, and I think they have some good opinions. I'm not here to say that CDAP and DCA is doing everything right. I think there are faults. But you don't attack a problem in the company by beginning at the top destroying the whole structure. I think you intelligently look at it, and here you are, as a Committee, trying to determine the value and the future of this program - I think you should look at the faults that do exist, and I'm sure you know many of those faults.

Rep. Bigos: Then answer the second part of my question which was, do you think that criticism is founded, based on your work as a coordinator, or do you think that it is specious criticism?

Mr. Somers: I think some of the criticism is founded. The idea of having it a pre-requisite I think was a fault. I

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

don't support that. That would be one criticism that I would accept as being logical and perhaps have a foundation, and I've experienced this as a great resentment by a lot of the town officials in Newington that it was more or less a requirement that they have to perform a CDAP in order to get state funds. But I still think that Newington would have applied in their wisdom for a plan of development like this, and done a lot better job because they felt, when they got done with it, there was going to be something to it. It wasn't going to be put on a shelf like a lot of other plans communities have gathering dust.

Mr. McKiernan, Coordinator, Hamden: I'm from Hamden, and a lot of other people are here today. I don't want to sound self-perpetuating, as many of us, I'm afraid, have sounded in coming forward here. Frankly, I think that the CDAP program is a vital tool in any community. Any vehicle by which you can involve citizens into local government I think is a valuable tool, and I think frankly, that CDAP does provide that opportunity in many communities for citizen participation that is not provided through the political process and through the process of boards and commissions, in all deference to Mr. DiMeo, who brought that point up. Certainly, a group of citizens as we have in Hamden who are interested in day care centers cannot find a particular board or commission in the town of Hamden who could help them and give them much assistance in the area of day care centers. I just wanted to make that point, that that is where I think the value of CDAP is. In citizen participation, in the planning process in town. To answer this vacated seat over here with respect to citizen participation and turnover, we've had in the vicinity of 300 people in CDAP in Hamden. We've had about a 50% turnover. I identify the turnover for three reasons: 1) People came to CDAP because they thought it would be a vehicle by which they could identify problems. They stayed there until they felt that they had satisfied their purpose, that they identified what they thought was a problem in the community, and once that was identified, they felt that, you know, they had achieved what they wanted to do and they went on their way to any number of things. And I've got to get on my way to a CDAP meeting pretty quickly. Frankly, any number of people, and I think this all balances out, became absolutely frustrated with the Department of Community Affairs regulations and red tape, and I'm afraid one or two of them might be in the room today. I might also point out that I think a lot of people in Hamden, and incidentally Hamden, as you are aware, joins North Haven which was very vocal about CDAP -- we had a lot of people in CDAP in Hamden who joined the program because they were scared to death of this monstrous thing that was being generated at the State Capitol. And once they found what we were trying to do in the

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

CDAP program, they dissipated back into their - wherever they came from to begin with. Again I'd like to point remarks to Mr. DiMeo, my representative incidentally, that I do not believe that the boards and commissions in most municipalities, and Hamden has 49,000 people - I do not believe that the boards and commissions in the municipality are equipped this time with staff, personnel, or funds to go through the horrendous problem there is of trying to develop programs and get the state funds that are necessary. Any of you people who have been involved in applications really realize that is almost a totally time consuming job for any individual. Boards and commissions, citizens, public-spirited people, do not have the time to come to the town hall and spend hour after hour after hour writing and following up applications. I think that is a very vital function of the CDAP staff, and I think frankly that is just about what CDAP has tried to do in Hamden, without I might say some frustration from the Department of Community Affairs. Whatever the case may be, certainly I'd like to express myself, and I won't be able to in a meeting later, that I do believe that the vital points of CDAP are citizen participation and assisting the boards and commissions where they are vacated. Thank you.

Rep. Gudelski, 110th District: I'd like to inquire about the cooperation and in-put that you might have received from the various boards, like and fire board, police board, and so on, in the town of Hamden.

Mr. McKiernan: Okay - do you want to know generally what their attitude has been?

Rep. Gudelski: Generally, right.

Mr. McKiernan: Generally their attitude has not been good.

Rep. Gudelski: Can you account for it?

Mr. McKiernan: Yes, I think I can account for some part of it. I think they felt there was an encroachment upon their authority, or at least that realm of authority that they imagined existed, but I think that frankly that, as time has gone on, that kind of fear has been somewhat dissolved when I think they realize we are there to help them. Certainly many of the local boards and commissions, I think, were fearful that CDAP was working against them, when in effect we were really trying to work with them, and to that extent.....

Rep. Gudelski: As a coordinator, what special effort did you exercise in order to eliminate that particular misunderstanding?

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Mr. McKiernan: Well, I'll tell you. There was no particular thing. Really, about the only thing you can do, and fortunately I've been a lifelong resident of Hamden, and I think some of the people knew me - and incidentally that might reflect on someone else's question about what are the qualifications for a coordinator - I think through that position and through just an attempt to communicate with them, sit down and talk to the department heads, meet with the boards and commissions, to try to explain to them fully that we're there to give them assistance, to help them develop programs and provide for them a vehicle by which some of the needs that they themselves had identified could be solved, is one of the ways that we've achieved it, and I think frankly we've had modest success within the framework in Hamden.

Rep. Bigos, 45th District: Could you estimate the benefits that your town has received in terms of money?

Mr. McKiernan: You mean in the way of grants from the Department of Community Affairs?

Rep. Bigos: Yes.

Mr. McKiernan: Zero. In all fairness to the Department of Community Affairs though, I should make you aware that we have only really within the eleven months that we've been functioning in Hamden, we have only really submitted one full application. We have seven others in the process, so that frankly, in all fairness to the Department of Community Affairs, they cannot give us what we have not asked for. We've only asked for one particular grant at this time.

Rep. Bigos: Can you give me an estimate of what you have asked for?

Mr. McKiernan: Yes. We have requested, by way of application, \$35,000 for a housing code enforcement program. We anticipate requesting \$39,000 for a tax abatement program so that the Davenport Village for the Elderly will not go bankrupt, which they are on the verge of doing now. We intend to request \$45,000 for two day care centers. We intend to request approximately \$50,000, I believe, for a major overall drug program in coordination with the Mental Health Commission. We intend to apply for \$15,000 in funds for the purpose of helping the youth solve their problems in the community. And we intend to submit an application for \$25,000 to help the elderly do some things in the community which they're functioning out of a \$4500 budget now.

Rep. Bigos: Do you have an industrial park program?

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

Mr. McKiernan: We have an industrial and economic development within the community, and I should say that we have not established an accurate dollar figure, but certainly one of the major concerns within the community generated by the citizens, supported by the boards and commissions, is the need for an overall plan of development of a very large substantial piece of land (industrial) we have in the community and IBD funds have been discussed at the agency, and I am sure that there is some anticipation of soliciting those funds, both stages, the planning and.....

Rep. Bigos: How much might that cost? A couple million?

Mr. McKiernan: I would say, my own estimate of the IBD funds, as I understand it, are in two phases kind of thing, a planning area and an implementation area, and I don't really believe that you can answer the second part until you know what the first one is. But I would guess at this point that some of the citizens who are knowledgeable in that field have been estimating that it would be in the vicinity of \$85,000 to do a comprehensive plan of development for the three large industrial tracts that we're talking about in Hamden. That would be the first phase. Exactly how much money that first phase might be talking about with respect to the implementation of that plan might certainly reach long distance telephone numbers.

Mr. Dave Reid, Coordinator, Milford: I know you've heard many of the praises of the CDAP program and I agree with them and won't sing them anymore. The tune is getting long. I would like to say that I favor the bill before you on the pre-requisite, on the removal of the pre-requisite for CDAP, but I would like to add that I think that it should that some form of planning be required, a plan of sufficient nature that allows you to realize that the community does, in fact, need these funds that it is requesting. Mr. Jones discussed many aspects that are involved, and I think that, in its basic context, too long in the past when we say planning, we mean just physical planning. We talk of putting buildings here and there, and housing here, and schools there, and we don't consider the other aspects of life that go on, and our answers have become very, actually stop-gap answers. We need to look at the total picture which is what CDAP allows you to do. But it doesn't have to be necessarily the brand of CDAP. The thing is that you have to look beyond the physical. You have to look at your social and administrative and your economic aspects. I can speak of the Milford program, and several of the questions that have been raised. We've talked of turnover and apathy and these type of things. Of course, Milford was one of the harder towns about accepting CDAP, and, as some people refer, we joined to be eligible for funds. Total picture in our one year

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

of officialdom in Milford, we have through DCA and the state, and the federal government, received approximately \$2,000,000. As far as the citizen force, our structure is such that we have 12 committees, ten men each, 120. I have twenty new faces since we started a year ago. I think my turnover is negligible. As far as apathy, I think when we started the program that we had perhaps rather than apathy, a lack of understanding as to what CDAP was doing. Many people raised the point that you raised -- about are we covering old ground. I think about the only time we're covering old ground is when somebody has dragged branches across the tracks. I really believe that we've picked up where we are, and we're working from there. As far as input from city officials and any type of friction, we do have occasional differences of opinion. But I feel a fantastic response from the city officials. We've been able in our year really to sit down and say to the officials - we'd like to help you, provide you with a citizen input; and, in this year's time, I think we've at least achieved this. We've opened up lines of communication between citizen and city official. I think, at the present point, a gentlemen before me mentioned the present credibility of the CDAP program. I am feeling a definite impact of present publicity on CDAP and its future. Last night, for example, I had two committees, and attendance which for these particular committees is normally high was very low. There's perhaps in the order of 30 to 40% of what it should be. Qualifications of the coordinator - after going to the University of Connecticut, I went through the ROTC program, and I was a helicopter pilot, and I think really the greatest qualification of any coordinator is being able to understand and deal with people, as has been mentioned before, but I think the helicopter points out that you have to be able to withstand a lot of flak. As far as opinions of our various boards and commissions, to summarize, I believe, as far as the turnover, as far as old ground, I think it really comes back to each particular community. I think why I begin with my recommendation on the pre-requisite is that this should be an item between the municipality itself and the commissioner. An item of negotiation between the two. We end up signing a contract, and agreeing to certain terms, and I think that, as long as the community agrees to take a good look at itself, find out what it does need. Perhaps it doesn't need a better educational system, or perhaps it does need economic development, but so that it agrees to at least ask the question - do we need? And it does ask the question, and it does perform the problem solving analysis where it's required. I think then that community itself will be better ahead. Thank you.

Mr. Joseph Kane, CDAP Coordinator, Marlborough: Most of the discussion that has been heard today has been primarily from the larger communities, and I thought it would

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

be well to reflect for a moment, if I might, on what is taking place in some of the small communities in the state, which there are a lot of. Concerning the two issues at hand on the bill first, I would like to express my personal opinion, No. 1, on whether there should be separate CDAP's. My first question that I pose to you as a committee is what basis are you going to have separate CDAP's on. Would it be on population, 1-10,000, 10-20,000? By these delineating factors, is a community of 9,000 different from a community with a population of 11,000, that they should fall in different categories? My second question is, would it possibly be on the basis of population density? A lot of regional planning agencies use this factor. Population densities, for instance in my community of 2,991, has a population density of about 113 per square mile. Many small communities fall into this type of a category. So the real question, if you were talking of separate CDAP's, are you talking in fact of different problems? Is the problem of the town in a small community different from the problem of the larger cities? Is that problem different from the problems that exist in the large cities of the State of Connecticut? Are there one, are there two, are there three different problems? This should be a consideration in discussion of whether there should be such things as separate CDAP's. The second question concerning this committee today is whether CDAP should be maintained as a pre-requisite. My personal feeling as a CDAP coordinator is that, yes, it should be. I graduated from the University of Connecticut wanting to go into urban planning, wanting particularly to go into social urban planning. It was not offered at the University; it was not offered at any of the graduate schools - city planning or urban planning. I chose CDAP because CDAP had such things as social services planning. It had such things as human resource planning. It took a comprehensive view of the needs of a community. The job has filled the experience void that I could not have gotten at a graduate school. It has helped my community out in some very interesting ways. The Town of Marlborough is a small community, as I said - 2991 at the last census figures. The town got into CDAP, from what I can understand - I'm not a son of the town of Marlborough; I went to Marlborough the first time because I was interviewed for the job. We're 28th in the state for taxes, local payment of taxes. Our tax rate at this time is 65 mills on a 70% assessment. The services that we got from the town were very limited because of our small size. Our educational budget represented anywhere, by any figuring, between 82 and 87% of our total budget. The town wanted some very basic little things. It wanted a bank. It had no bank. It wanted a post office. It had no post office. A little identity thing like that. Well, a planning commission, a zon-

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

ing commission, a board of selectmen, find it very difficult to get the little things that people like this implemented. There's no rallying point that brings together the people, and the ongoing boards and commissions. The chairman of my planning commission - you question whether there is a duplication of efforts, sir - the chairman of my planning commission has come out point blank and said the town of Marlborough was growing so rapidly that the only thing our planning commission can do right now is to approve or disapprove of sub-divisions, and check road sizes and make sure the roads are being put in correctly. We don't have time to plan and see where the roads are going, or what we are doing to the town. We do not have the time. We meet as volunteers, we meet twice a month, our meetings last four to five hours, we have special meetings and everything else, and we do not in fact have the time to do long-range planning. We are counting on CDAP to do that. The town of Marlborough's CDAP program has no consultant. In other words, there is no big expense of a large consulting firm. The town is doing it on its own. It is after a bank and a post office and some way to bring taxes down from 28th in the state. Again, a relative figure, but somewhere where they feel that they will be getting the services that they are paying for. The bank has come into town, as of a month ago. CDAP was started a year ago. What part of getting the bank into town did CDAP play? I cannot say in fact, but I can say that one of the things the Connecticut Banking Commission was very interested in was a study of transportation flows that was done on the major highways going in front of the site where the bank was going to be. How was this traffic survey done? This may seem like a mute point, but I think it's interesting. It was done by traffic counters that were loaned to us from the University of Connecticut, as part of their relationships with ongoing programs. It was loaned to the Marlborough CDAP program, at which point we used the traffic counters to do a traffic count in town. It was utilized as a factual thing to get a bank into town. Those are some of the accomplishments of a CDAP in a small community. The accomplishments are very small. The representatives from the League of Women Voters here today...the federal government has the water and soil conservation service which has prepared intensive soil and topographical surveys in the past of all the towns in the Hartford County, in particular Hartford County because Marlborough is a member. The town of Marlborough has never received them, but they got lost in the shuffle somewhere, as I'm sure that papers get lost at your home or whatever it may be. It came in, but it was never given to the right people that could utilize it. Well, the League of Women Voters, we have gotten the maps - the League of Women Voters has offered to color them for us, saving

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

us a \$2,000 expense. The League is interested in the CDAP program in our community. I'm not trying to take a stand for the League, but I will say that, in our community, the League offered this as a community service. Fraternal organizations in our community are offering picking up building of sidewalks without concrete, a theory that is generated by CDAP in the town to take pedestrian traffic off one of the roads that used to be a state highway and no longer is, taking it off the main road and making it a separation of pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic. These are minor points that I will not say would not eventually have been done in the course of the town's future. But I would say that they have been done, they are being done, and CDAP is one of those catalysts that is getting them done. I would like to mention that CDAP is a catalyst. CDAP is not something that is a bed of roses or a cherry pie. CDAP is something that causes controversy because it presents an issue. It presents an issue in our town of whether we need a town hall or not, like whether you need Senate chambers or not. It's an issue that there are positives and negatives to, and when there are positives and negatives, there are people that agree and disagree, and therefore that's controversy, and on every issue that CDAP brings up, there are the positives and the negatives. If it brings up one issue and 80% of the people believe in that issue, that is 80% of the people are for it, 20% are against it. With two issues of the same, or with five issues, or with ten issues that are brought up, that's all the more people that can say to any one issue, I don't feel in favor of it, but to the other nine, they're in favor of those issues. Thank you very much. I hope you have a little idea of what a small town is like.

Rep. Bigos: Am I correct in understanding that the town of Marlborough would be in real tough shape if this program would be eliminated?

Mr. Kane: Would the town of Marlborough be in real tough shape? No, sir, I would say not. I would say -- well, the question, sir, I would ask you is, I'm sure that before the last legislature of the State of Connecticut had some way of determining where they were getting the revenues from. And my question to you is why did they need a revenue task force? They needed it because they wanted a unified body to make decisions on where they should go in revenues, where they should derive them from. Am I correct? This is my, from the press, what I felt the revenue task force was meant to accomplish. And I'm not trying to make it a political issue. I am saying the point is we may have ongoing boards and commissions, we may have ongoing things that handle jobs, but every once in a while it's good to take a step backwards, or to take a step aside,

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

and say - all right, where are we? Where are we going? Are we doing what should be done? Are we meeting the needs of the people? So the answer to your question point-blank is yes, the town of Marlborough would survive without CDAP, but I think that with the CDAP the townspeople are more aware of issues. A town meeting used to have 80 people. We had a town meeting on a expenditure in education. We had 220 people at that meeting, the largest turnout that ever existed in the town. There is more citizen interest. I'm not saying it's for or against anything, but there is more citizen interest. And isn't that one of the most important things - that people know what's going on, and at least take a stand on it?

Rep. Bigos: You've answered my question very nicely.

Mr. Kane: Thank you. Any other questions?

Rep. Tudan: Thank you. Anyone else care to speak?

Mr. Donald Galuzzi, Coordinator, Shelton: I'd like to say that CDAP should be retained as a pre-requisite for towns to receive funding, and my basic premise is that this is a requirement of many businesses today. They don't survive, they don't grow, unless they document their needs, unless they program, unless they budget. And I think this same premise should be carried into local municipal government today, and the fact that this is a requirement, I think, is going to be one of the strong points of the cities' growth, and an orderly growth of the city. The fact that they know what their needs are, they know what their problems are, and that we have a document sorting out the needs, setting the priorities, and hopefully finding a ways and means to solve that problem. The fact that citizens care enough to delve into their community problems and come up with solutions that they may or may not be able to implement shows that there is a need for this kind of vehicle in the state today. Connecticut is a Yankee town, a Yankee city, 169 of them. I think this is a tradition that CDAP is fostering and bringing out more of this in the process. Some who say that the state is requiring you to look at these twelve areas, that it's mandating that you do these things. I don't believe this I don't say that this is a valid issue. I think the fact that is - that requiring cities and requiring people to look at their problems is getting them more interested in the problems, and hopefully will change the cities problems into coming out of this problem into a solution. I think one of the things we looked at, as Pete mentioned from Ansonia, we're getting together; we're communicating for the first time. Shelton is a community that has been divided for many, many years by white and blue collar workers. We've

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

gotten such a good cross-representation of people in our city that we've bridged that gap. People no longer look at their city as a Huntington, as a White Hills, as a downtown mill city. They're looking at it as a community now. They're realizing that one problem is related to another. That a physical problem alone is no problem at all. It has administrative implications; it has budgetary implications; it has human resource. I hope that you will keep this requirement, and I hope, in speaking for my agency, that you will fund second round CDAP's so that we can take this document and implement it to the greatest extent that we can. To take away the plan now, after working for two years, makes no sense at all. We feel that that is a waste of state resources, because a lot of people put their time and effort in; a lot of state monies have been expended for this. Give us a chance. Let us try to take the document and make it a workable solution to the cities' problems. I think you'll see great success. Thank you.

Rep. Gudelski: I have a question, sir. In your opinion, do you think that the guidelines that are a pre-requisite for, say, a city of New Haven, should also apply to a town, say, of Shelton?

Mr. Galuzzi: No, I think there should be some flexibility built into the program. I definitely think that this would be a good idea. I don't know what kind of rational basis you'd decide that, but some kind of alternate mechanism would be better than what is presently, probably. For instance, I think the requirement may be geared more bigger cities with professional staff, where this is a difficulty in trying to get this is some of the smaller communities. For instance, this should probably be changed somewhat for the smaller communities. Thank you.

Rep. Tudan: Anyone else care to talk?

Mr. Bill Kuehn, Assistant City Planner, Middletown: I'm also full-time Incarn service to the CDAP program. In Middletown the CDAP agency will soon be discussing with the Common Council approximately 500 programs which will have come out as a result of two years of study. This doesn't mean that there are going to be 500 requests for state and/or federal monies. Probably 85-90% of these programs are geared toward administrative changes toward the city of Middletown. Middletown has a population of close to 37,000 people. It has a myriad of agencies, boards, commissions, none of which know what the other is doing. We feel that the CDAP program is providing some kind of continuity between all these boards and commissions. The end product I see of CDAP is a method whereby a systematic administrative approach is provided to the mayor

WEDNESDAY

STATE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

FEBRUARY 24, 1971

and the common council. I would hope that our CDAP would provide a PPBS system for the city of Middletown. That's a Planned Programming Budget System. There are the other by-products of the CDAP process. For example, in 1965, when the city of Middletown had a comprehensive plan done, it cost around \$30,000. This time it cost zero because it will come from the CDAP process. The CDAP process in Middletown is forcing the many agencies that I've spoken of to think about the future. Traditionally, boards, agencies, commissions are reaction bodies. We are now meeting with them intensively getting them to think about what is going to happen five years in the future. Now they can better coordinate their activities with other boards and agencies. This is a very valuable result, we feel. In Middletown, we have had difficulties getting the citizen to participate. We have approximately 120 people actively involved in the citizen advisory committees. We have done something different there. We think that to help explain the CDAP process to the citizenry as of now, there's one public hearing required of the CDAP program, and that is to be conducted by the CDAP agency prior to submission to the common council. Each of the functional advisory committees in Middletown has been holding a public hearing of their own. We started off with a public hearing last July - that was the first one, and we had about thirteen people present. It has grown, this idea has grown so that the last one, which was held on education several weeks ago, had well over 250 people present. We feel that presenting each one of these functional programs to the public in this manner we can get better dissemination on newspaper coverage, etc. So you might take this into consideration. Thank you.

Rep. Tudan: Anyone else care to speak? If not, we'll declare the hearing closed.