

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-817		5938	3	9	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Transportation</i> 401</li> <li>• <i>Transportation</i> 402</li> <li>• <i>Transportation</i> 416</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5072- 5080</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3403</li> </ul>

**H-118**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Saturday, June 5, 1971 122

ad

Will you remark further on Senate A. If not, the question is on adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. Senate A is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended.

MR. PAPANDREA:

I now move for passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A in concurrence. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

The Clerk has two favorables from Appropriations. Substitute for House Bill 5889, Reimbursement of House Bills and Rent Homes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

CLERK:

Government Administration and Policy. House Bill 7768 - An Amendment and Reinstatement of the Special Act of the Corporation and Government Elect (inaudible) Association.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tabled for the calendar and printing.

CLERK:

Page 25, Calendar 1388, substitute for House Bill 5938 - An

Saturday, June 5, 1971

Act Concerning Removal of Abandoned Motor Vehicles by Municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 108th.

MR. TACINELLI:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. TACINELLI:

This bill gives a municipality through its legislative body the right to remove abandoned inoperable or unregistered motor vehicles. Any such vehicle left on private property which remains unmoved for 30 days and after a request for removal to do so by the property owners and by the proper authority. I believe there is an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call House Amendment A.

MR. TACINELLI:

With your permission, in lieu of reading the amendment, I would yield to my colleague of the 104th.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman of the 104th.

MR. OLIVER:

Technical amendment, Housekeeping, facilitates prosecution of those who litter our highways with abandoned motor vehicles.

Saturday, June 5, 1971

I move its adoption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further. Gentleman from the 127th.

MR. PROVENZANO:

Through you, to the gentleman who presented the bill. If a person who owns an automobile and parks it on his own property and that automobile is not registered, is that person subject to having his automobile removed by the municipality under the provisions of this act.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman of the 108th care to respond.

MR. TACINELLI:

Through you sir, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment. Gentleman of the 127th.

MR. PROVENZANO:

I will wait for presentation of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House A. If not, the question is on its adoption. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark on the bill as amended. Gentleman from the 108th.

MR. TACINELLI:

The bill as amended includes streets and highways in this

Saturday, June 5, 1971

1

act and it makes a good bill better. I urge its passage as amended by House Amendmench Schedule A.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 127th.

MR. PROVENZANO:

I have not seen the amendment and I would like to know whether the amendment also includes any changes in the proposed bill other than define.

MR. OLIVER:

Through the speaker, then the answer is no.

MR. PROVENZANO:

Then it appears to me that the bill does allow the municipality to remove automobiles on private property, because the bill says (inaudible) made by action of its legislative body provide for the removal of abandoned inoperable or unregistered motor vehicles within the limit of such municipality. What it does then is give the legislative body the authority to determine which automobiles ought to be removed. I agree that automobiles which are inoperable and do provide unsightly areas in the town should be cleaned up. However, if a person has an automobile, antique automobiles, gives the legislative body that authority to determine whether it should be removed or not. It appears to me also that the person owning the automobile has absolutely no recourse over the provisions of this act. I think that this bill should be passed with some protection of an owner of an automobile who does not want to comply with this section of the act. I don't think it

Saturday, June 5, 1971

is a good idea to give the legislative body the total powers that this provides for.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 98th.

MR. DI MEO:

It is still not clear to me as to who has the authority to physically remove the vehicle.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman care to respond.

MR. OLIVER:

The local board or officer as it states in our files shall be responsible for notifying the owner and causing publication of the general notice before removal and disposition of such motor vehicle.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 33rd.

MR. PUGLIESE:

The intent of the bill is to make it a bit easier for the local communities to rid themselves of the mass of junk cars and abandoned cars that (inaudible) the state. The problem today is that you have to take it through the courts in order to get rid of them. What we are trying to do in the bill is provide an alternate needs by which the local authorities through the administrative bodies, would designate a person who would have the authority who can initiate the elimination of these cars. The only step that would be eliminated from the present regulation is

Saturday, June 5, 1971

that you would not have to go through the courts.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 69th.

MR. ROSE:

To the person who brought the bill out, does this bill take over the cost of removal from the owner.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 108th care to respond.

MR. TACINELLI:

Through you sir, no, I think the amendment takes care of that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 120th.

MR. PROVINELLI:

Through you, a technical question on line 8 where it says notice in a newspaper having a substantial circulation, etc. The type of a notification or notice in a newspaper, would that be referring to the individual or the subject matter in general.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond.

MR. TACINELLI:

Through you sir, I believe it would be the subject matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 127th.

MR. PROVENZANO:

I am concerned with this bill because it does not do what

Saturday, June 5, 1971

the proponents of the bill want it to do. I agree with the intent of this legislation and I know what the intent is. It is to provide for the removal of unsightly automobiles from our towns and municipalities. But this bill goes further than that. This bill says that the legislative body can remove at its discretion any automobile if it is parked for more than 30 days. And I am concerned because you may have an automobile parked in your own driveway or your own parking lot, and I have received many complaints through the years from people who might not like to see an automobile parked on somebody else's property. Now it is always somebody else's property that someone is concerned about. It is not their own. The automobile is owned and it is private property and I say that the municipality has no business going in on someone's private property and remove that automobile whether it is registered or not. You have a right to own that automobile and you have a right to keep it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman, from the 10th.

MR. FRAZIER:

I would just like to know one thing. Where are you going to put the cars.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 108th care to respond.

MR. Will you remark further. Gentleman from the 120th.

MR. PROVINELLI:

For the second time, I concur that there should be a feeling

Saturday, June 5, 1971

129

ad

for the homeowner or the owner of a vehicle on his particular piece of property. But I think in line 3 of the proposed bill, just the word abandoned would seem to clear up that area insofar as I don't think a neighbor would have a right to have an automobile inoperable or an automobile taken away unless it was completely abandoned. I think this particular word would straighten that particular issue out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 18th.

MR. GENOVESI:

I have to speak against this bill although I think the intent of this bill is excellent and trying to correct the situation that we have in many of our cities and towns. I am not sure of the intent as Mr. Povinelli is. It would appear from the way that the bill is written, that if I had an antique car which I kept in my backyard, working on it, as many people have, and my neighbor didn't happen to like it, he could apply to the legislative body to have that car removed. As a result to that, I have to vote in opposition to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 33rd.

MR. PUGLIESE:

Speaking for the second time, I think the gentleman that are opposing the bill are reading into it something that was not intended and I don't believe is in there. It states any municipality made by action of its legislative body provides for the

Saturday, June 5, 1971

130

ad

removal of these abandoned and inoperable or unregistered motor vehicles. I would assume that most communities have some legislation whether in your zoning regulation or by ordinance, that does say what is an illegally parked vehicle. This does not intend to go beyond your local regulations in that respect. It only intends to help the local communities through its legislative body once it has determined which of these vehicles are abandoned and left in places they should not be, to get rid of them. This is all the bill intends to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, the question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 25, Calendar 1392, substitute for House Bill 8578 - An Act Concerning Changes in the Regional School District Statutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 170th.

MR. LA GROTTA:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MR. LA GROTTA:

S-82  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL. 14  
PART 7  
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 74

File 1186; Cal. 643, House Bill 6904, File 1582; Cal. 1150, House Bill 7901  
File 1342; Cal. 1192, House Bill 7148, File 1334; Cal. 1204, House Bill 7256  
File 1393; Cal. 1214, House Bill 7014, File 1423; Cal. 1226, House Bill 8914  
File 1073; Cal. 1257, House Bill 7048, File 1464; Cal. 1262, House Bill 8271  
File 1474; Cal. 1267, House Bill 9020, File 1457; Cal. 1271, House Bill 5049  
File 1628; Cal. 1272, House Bill 5415, File 1632; Cal. 1273, House Bill 5627  
File 1616; Cal. 1274, House Bill 5709, File 1630; Cal. 1275, House Bill 5714  
File 1575; Cal. 1276, House Bill 5834, File 1569; Cal. 1277, House Bill 5938  
File 1585; Cal. 1278, House Bill 6210, File 1627; Cal. 1279, House Bill 6367  
File 1565; Cal. 1280, House Bill 6561, File 1555; Cal. 1281, House Bill 6674  
File 1586; Cal. 1285, House Bill 7077, File 1556; Cal. 1287, House Bill 8272  
File 1566; Cal. 1289, House Bill 8578, File 1579; Cal. 1290, House Bill 8799  
File 1640; Cal. 1293, House Bill 9246, File 1638; Cal. 1294, House Bill 9256  
File 1637; Cal. 1295, House Bill 9001, File 737; Cal. 629, House Bill 7642  
File 638; Cal. 721, House Bill 7802, File 1127; Cal. 755, House Bill 8761  
File 773; Cal. 802, House Bill 8658, File 906; Cal. 964, House Bill 6197  
File 1359; Cal. 975, House Bill 7609, File 876; Cal. 990, House Bill 8561  
File 1172; Cal. 1041, House Bill 9196, File 1232.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of all those bills, I move for suspension of the rules, first of all, for consideration of those which were not single starred or were not double starred rather.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor of suspension of the rules indicate by saying, "aye"  
All those opposed? Suspension is granted.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**TRANSPORTATION**

**PART 2  
338-674**

**1971**

18  
mr

## TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 26, 1971

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, sir. Any questions? This bill we are now hearing is 7304, it was included with the inspection bills, although it is not an inspection bill. It is a bill which concerns the registration of vehicles by military personnel. Any one else to speak in favor of the bill? Anyone opposed to the bill? The hearing is closed on 7304.

We will now go to S. B. 1151 (Sen. Pac, Rep. Badolato, Rep. Gregorzek, Rep. Morris, Rep. Gaffney, Rep. Pugliese) AN ACT CONCERNING SNOWMOBILES. Also, with this bill; there are many other bills involved: 1151, 5592, 7913, 7041, 7360, 7703 and 7849. Is there anyone to speak in favor of any of these bills?

Senator Mondani: Many of these bills have different "concepts" and rather than go through each one - if the people appearing in favor or against - could also enlighten us to their feelings on registration; whether it should be in Motor Vehicle; whether it should be in the Department of Agriculture; if the operator should be licensed; or not licensed; if so, how old the operator must be; and any restrictions on operations. Because different ones call different types of things. So, if you are "for" or "against" a particular concept - you don't necessarily have to identify what bill it is - we would appreciate you saying that, you know, if you liked it or disliked that type of concept. It would save us a great deal of time, in reading each an every bill, to pick out one or two things.

Rep. Pugliese: Mr. Chairman; I am from the 33rd., District, Plainville. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I am going to go out of context for two other bills that I have submitted, so that I can go to another hearing. Briefly, on S. B. 1151, this is a jointly sponsored bill. Its a bill that has been approved by the Snowmobile Association. And, basically what this particular bill does is establish a regulatory commission, within the Dept. of Agriculture of the State of Connecticut. And, I don't think I ought to go into it any further than that. It is a lengthy bill but this is one of the alternatives, that Senator Mondani mentioned. And I am in favor of this bill.

The second bill that I would like to touch on just briefly, is H. B. 5938, concerning removal of abandoned motor vehicles by municipalities. Now this bill, also, does not stand alone, it seeks to accomplish the same purpose as S. B. 703, which we heard here today. It has a little different approach in that this bill allows a municipality, after a period of 30 days; having given notice to a property owner that an abandoned vehicle exists on their property. The municipality would then be empowered to take action to remove this vehicle, without having to go through the courts. This is the big stumbling block to local municipalities removing abandoned motor vehicles today. There is a reimbursement procedure in this bill, in which the State of Connecticut would reimburse the local community to the tune of \$25 per vehicle removed. This \$25 figure was an arbitrary figure, based on what our people back in town, thought would be an average of that the

19  
mr

## TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 26, 1971

Rep. Pugliese(continued): towns would have to pay in order to remove these vehicles, getting them hauled away. We have done this on a two day period in town, the police removed vehicles, by request, and we were able to remove something like 40 or 50 vehicles. So I think that something along this line is worthwhile.

The other bill that I would like to touch on, briefly, is H. B. 5202, this concerns maximum noise levels of motor vehicles operating on streets and highways. We have heard another bill at a previous hearing, on this. There is also another bill that was mentioned, that will be coming up next week, on the same subject, and the concern here is that something be done to regulate noise levels on the highways. And, I think that any of us that have sponsored these bills, are willing that the best possible bill that can come out of the Committee; should be brought to the Senate and House to be passed. The difference between the bill I am submitting and the other two, is that this bill does not establish the noise levels, as the others do. But leaves this up to the discretion of the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, on advice from the Health Commissioner. And, the only reason I did this, rather than establish the levels, is that I felt that their discretionary power might be of some value, in that there may be a slight difference in decibel ratings that could be applied on the major highways where they run through open countries and something lesser in the cities. Whether this is a valid point, I am sure that the Committee will take up. Thank you.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else to speak in favor of snowmobiles? Any snowmobile bill?

Judge Henry Gwiazda: I am appearing here, individually and as Director of The Connecticut Snowmobile Association, authorized to speak for 500 members, including individuals and clubs. We are the authors of the bill 1151, which I am happy to say in listening to the comments of the Representatives, is the most comprehensive study - piece of Legislation which can be submitted on a newly arrived recreational activity - on which people have difficulty in finding how to regulate control. We, as snowmobilers, have taken it upon ourselves to study this; to study the activity; the equipment; and then compile this law. In answer to a member of this Committee's question; we have based our organization entirely upon that of Boating Commission, which exists in this state. We have placed this activity, instead of in the Motor Vehicle Dept., into the proper Department, where it belongs, namely, Agriculture, under control of Parks and Forests, where most of this activity takes place.

We have gone to the trouble, not only to regulate and control and administrate; but we believe in policing our own activities. To give you an illustration; it is most difficult for a property owner to identify the present snowmobile activity which is contrary to his wishes, and to his property rights. Because he cannot identify that vehicle, only as a "yellow snowmobile". The

33  
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 26, 1971

Rep. Holdsworth(continued): you used for the estimated cost of mailing this?

Mr. Carroll: To mail First Class: \$1,353,370.

Rep. Holdsworth: Could you tell me how you arrived at this figure?

Mr. Carroll: I don't have them here and -----

Rep. Holdsworth: How many operator's licenses do we have in the state?

Mr. Carroll: Roughly, between operator's licenses and motor vehicle owners, we are talking in the figure of three million. At 50¢ a piece, at least. That is the point I am making that is this law or bill is drafted; it says "all changes". And the last time we got together a public acts book of motor vehicle law changes, after the 1969 Session, it consisted of 110 pages.

Rep. Holdsworth; I get the point of this whole thing. The fact is, a great many people do not actually recognize or are aware or made aware, by one means or another; of the changes. And they could be put in an unfortunate position, relative to the law. Could this be changed, rather than the whole law - just the changes-per se, rather than the whole law?

Mr. Carroll: I think I know what you are driving at, and that is you want changes that effect, lets say,; traffic laws; and requirements to register a vehicle, perhaps; or something of that sort. I don't know. I can't tell you the cost in such a program. But of course, it would be less than this. And, I assume, that an effort would be made to do that on a I B M card, which would accompany a renewal of a registration or a renewal of: an operator's license. But, it gets a little more difficult to estimate cost in that case, and you don't know how many laws are going to be enacted by a given Legislature. We are addressing ourselves to the language of the bill, as written. But, there are; and I would like to stress that; after each Session, the Safety Commission in particular, gets out several news releases. At least in respect to the changes in the traffic laws.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, Mr. Carroll. Anyone in opposition to the bill? The hearing is closed on 5924.

The next bill is H. B. 5938 (Rep. Pugliese) AN ACT CONCERNING REMOVAL OF ABANDONED MOTOR VEHICLES BY MUNICIPALITIES. Anyone in favor of the bill? Anyone opposed?

Mr. Edward Carroll: Speaking for the Dept of Motor Vehicles, we would like to go on record as being opposed to 5938.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, sir. Anyone else opposed to the bill? The hearing is closed on 5938.

The next bill is H. B. 6234 (Rep. Wenz, Rep. Gormley, Sen. Burke) AN ACT CONCERNING EMBLEMS ON SLOW MOVING VEHICLES. Anyone in favor of this bill? Anyone opposed?