

SB 1041

PA 866 (Vetoed)

1971

Transportation 444, 448-463

House 6165-6176

Senate 2665-2670, 2674-2677

↳ Veto Session 296-305

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

**PART 2
338-674**

1971

TRANSPORTATION

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

Rep. Miscikoski, presiding

Members present: Senators:

Representatives: Reinhold, DeBaise, Nickols, Grab, Frate, Boggini, O'Dea, Gudelski, Holdridge, Connors, Cretella, Holdsworth, Gregorzek, McHugh.

Rep. Miscikoski: We will now open the hearing of the Transportation Committee. We will hear first any Senators or Representatives who want to speak on any bill. Yes, Senator?

Sen. Jackson: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; the first bill I wish to speak on is S. B. 336 (Sen. Jackson) AN ACT CONCERNING THE TROUT BROOK CONNECTOR TO INTERSTATE ROUTE 84 IN WEST HARTFORD. I think that action should be taken by the state to complete the connector. At the time it was first proposed, it was first proposed to run a greater distance to the north, in fact, almost to Fern Street in West Hartford. This was revised several years ago to have it run to Farmington Avenue. The town of West Hartford and the State Highway Dept. have been meeting to try to come to an acceptable compromise to cut the connector off at some point south of Farmington Avenue. And we would like this Committee to take action to solidify this agreement, which I hope will be reached between the town and the state. And, I will, with your permission submit a substitute bill, if the proper agreement can be worked out.

The second bill I would like to speak to is S. B. 1041 (Sen. Jackson) AN ACT CONCERNING INTERSTATE ROUTE 291 IN WEST HARTFORD AND BRLOOMFIELD. This is a most controversial section of 291, as it runs through the westerly section of West Hartford. I personally believe that 291 should not, under any circumstances, go through what is known as the N. D. C. property, or reservoir area which is in the westerly part of West Hartford. I believe that the Committee and the Highway Dept., in its discussion, feels that 291 is necessary in the first place; that some definite action be taken by this Legislature, to determine that the reservoir area shall remain inviolate. Again, we have a statement of purpose bill, and with your permission, I would file a substitute bill - to have one prepared to show that if the highway is constructed, that under no circumstances would it be allowed to go through the reservoir area; but would have to go to the west. One other I would ask you to explore is the pending relocation of route 10, which is scheduled at the present, further west than the present 291. There is a possibility that there could be a savings in monies by the combination of the two routes. The highway officials have vetoed this suggestion in the past. I would ask this Committee, in its discussion to look into the matter, to see if there is a possible saving in money and convenience to the traveling public, by the combining the two roads. The other speakers from the town of West Hartford will be here to present testimony on both bills. And, if there are further questions, in Executive Session, we would be most happy to come and explain to the Committee any questions they may have. Thank you.

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

- Mr. Custer(continued): as its intent the cooperative endeavors between the town of West Hartford and the state Highway Department to determine the location of this particular connector for which funds already have been appropriated. We have been working closely with the highway department and simply continue to do that with the blessing of the General Assembly. Thank you.
- Rep. Miscikoski: Thank you, sir. Anyone else in favor? Anyone opposed?
- Mr. John Bentley: State Highway Department, the department cannot support this bill. The department feels that it would be undesirable to change by legislation the broadly defined geographic limits and location of the proposed Trout Brook Connector, also know as SR 501, from the description which now appears in Sect. 13a-198b 33 of the statutes. This paragraph reads as follows: "State Road 510 in West Hartford from the vicinity of Park Road to the vicinity of Farmington Ave. for engineering and acquisition of rights-of-way, not exceeding one million five hundred thousand dollars." The Department is presently coordinating with the town in order to arrive at a mutually acceptable line and scope of work for this connector. This liaison has reached the stage where the town and the state are basically in agreement with each other's desires and needs, and a premature statute definition of limits might delay final agreement and would limit the available courses of action.
- Rep. Frate: What is this bill in here for? What are they trying to do - change the lines?
- Mr. Bentley: I can't speak for the people who submitted the bill, but there is no body to the bill - only a statement of purpose. And the statement of purpose reads: "to designate the geographical limits and locations of the proposed Trout Brook Connector as authorized in the statutes".
- Rep. Miscikoski: We will go to S. B. 825 (Sen. Mondani) AN ACT AUTHORIZING BONDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE BRIDGE ON THOMPSONVILL ROAD IN SUFFIELD CROSSING THE CONNECTICUT RIVER TO MAIN STREET IN ENFIELD. Anyone in favor? Anyone opposed? Any comment from the highway department?
- Mr. Bentley: I have them, sir, they are lengthy and I believe that they are ones we submitted before. So, with your permission, I will submit a written statement.
- Rep. Miscikoski: Thank you, sir. Next is S. B. 1041 (Sen. Jackson) AN ACT CONCERNING INTERSTATE ROUTE 291 IN WEST HARTFORD AND BLOOMFIELD.
- Sen. Rome: Mr. Chairman, may I may a comment - neither for or opposed? For the record, I think it may clarify - this is designed to designate the geographic limits and I think that the basis concern was whether or not too many roads in this area would be in

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Sen. Rome(continued): the vicinity of or pass over the reservoir. I have met with the Governor and the Commissioner of Transportation; and the Transportation officials are here. The Governor has made it clear, during and after the election; and the Commissioner has reiterated, that 291 is not going to be over the reservoir. And I think this is the basic concern of the author of this bill. I think that is important to point out to the public. You may have comments later, but is that generally the decision of the department? I understand that they will have a report as soon as it is possible, but they have not chosen an alternate route.

Chairman Miscikoski: Does the highway department have any comments?

Mr. John Bentley: I have a brief statement. Since there is no body to the bill as submitted, the Department is uncertain what is intended. The Department does wish to point out, however, that establishing geographical limits and location of the proposed expressway by Legislation would place a restriction on the ability of the Commissioner to make alterations in a proposed routing in response to testimony brought out at public hearings, meetings and liaisons with concerned groups involving choice of location.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you. Anyone else want to oppose this bill? Are you in favor?

Mrs. Kitowski: I didn't bring this up to read, but I did bring it up to show you to indicate that it is available. Could I please speak while you are still here (to Sen. Rome) because I am interested in your comments. Which as far I can see, really mean very little. No one ever suggested that the highway was going to go over the reservoir to start with. I don't think that any plan - and I give full credit ---well, then your promise, sir, that its not going to go over the reservoir means - its "words, words, words" and you can't read all this (books) and go through all of these clippings; and not recognize empty words for what they are. Could I at least say, that if someone is going to make a promise; that they would state what Gov. Meskill has stated - which is really much clearer than that. I have one of these for every member of the Committee, and it includes comments of Dr. Foote, because I don't believe he is able to come today. (to the audience) I'm awfully sorry, I can't really----

Chairman Miscikoski: Mrs. Kitowski, you have to talk to this Committee, and not to the public. May I have your attention, people? You will have your turn; presently, she is talking to us.

Mrs. Kitowski: All right. Again, out of respect for the democratic system, I can only say that if people came, they would also like to hear those people who are testifying; not necessarrily me but at least I would have like to have heard the previous remarks; and it is totally impossible. We are delighted to hear that Commissioner Wood seems to share our concern for presently existing parklands. And, you will pardon us if we seem somewhat

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mrs. Kitowski(continued): skeptical; but the same kind of words that we just heard, have been stated before and then we witnessed a letter from Commissioner Conklin to Mayor Grant, stating that "after this entire hearing" this is the transcript of the public hearing in West Hartford - "most of which dealt with Reservoir 6, which is above Albany Ave." The letter that came out on Feb. 9, announced that "the route had been reviewed and somewhat revised up to Albany Ave. but no review at all, had been done of the route north of Albany Ave." That meant that there was a total ignoring of the entire public hearing. I can only assume at some point, people will realize that there are 11 towns involved here.

To date, the response of the department has been to juggle the line back and forth - but within MDC property. What we are trying to point out is, that perhaps the concern of the person who drafted this bill, is concerned that it not go over the reservoir. But, I think that any child would be able to understand that you can't run a highway over the reservoir - what we are concerned with is that the highway not go through MDC property at all. Apparently, they're not - and this is how I feel that the Legislature can fill a role; that they can insure the sanctity of MDC property. One of the comments made by a MDC Commissioner - one of the more alert Commissioners; and may I say one of the few Commissioners who understands how the water supply operates. After having done - with the League of Women Voters - an analysis of all the Commissioners and their knowledge of MDC. Maurice Cronin of Wethersfield indicated that the MDC had considered taking court action against the state when this highway was contemplated, but decided not to because, quote;"despite the power of the MDC, we felt that the state would still win". If that is true, then all MDC property in this area, is in danger whenever the state wants to take any kind of action. It seems that at least, to me, the Legislature could fulfil that kind of role.

One final statement, because we are - we know you already have access to all of this material. This was never a property owner's movement. It shouldn't be regarded as such and apparently still causes a great deal of confusion in the highway department because it isn't. It is a group of people who have been concerned about the heritage we give our children. It is also not a West Hartford group. The 6 people who signed the statement that went to Gov. Dempsey in June 1969, were one of your own people, Sen. Wilbur Smith from Hartford; a former President of an Insurance company from Glastonbury; the Health Officer from Wethersfield; a college professor from Newington; a lady from Bloomfield whose husband was a MDC Commissioner; and myself. I think that in spite of all the publicity about it, there is such a thing as having a great deal of publicity and not much action. It seems to me that there is no question among highway people that updating existing roads can save you from spending millions of dollars on new roads. Putting design into those areas where the pressing need exists; means that you won't have to have this highway go right next to Connecticut General, just because they think

8
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mr. Kitowski(continued): that is where it should go. It seems to me that we have to take into account a number of other groups besides industry. And as the final comment in our letter to Gov. Dempsey said: "the people who are concerned about the heritage we are providing for generations to come. It would seem to us imperative to place clear air; pure water; and areas of quiet sanctuary ahead of maximum highway convenience". Thank you.

Rep. Holdridge: I just wanted to say that I-95, six lanes, goes over the Groton Reservoir, and doesn't seem to bother it.

Mrs. Kitowski: I am sure that Dr. Bowers can clue you in on the quality of that water, because we have been doing studies since then, on what is happening. Unfortunately, this is what happened in the beginning. One of the people in the Bureau of Public Roads said to me: "Gee, I live next to a reservoir with a big highway over it, and nothing happened for years". However, have you not examined what has happened in Michigan, Vermont, at Lake Erie, and all of the places where people said "nothing" was happening? And therefore, why were we worried? Dr. Bowers will be glad to answer any questions as to just the chloride content, which has quadrupled in many reservoirs which have roads running next to them. If you want your water, that way - fine - I think that MDC water is of high quality now, and my feeling is that you have a certain obligation to keep it that way.

Chairman Miscikoski: Is there anybody else? Are you speaking in favor?

Dr. George Bowers: I am a physician and a chemist and I have been very concerned about the inter-action of roadways on public water supplies. I will leave with you a statement that I prepared and discussed before the Public Health Council in Oct. 22, 1970, demonstrating that there are inter-actions between highways the traffic highways and our water supplies which we previously have not taken much cognizance of. I might say that in the area of science today, trace metal metabolism in these inter-actions are coming to the forefront. They are being funded more so than any of the funds we are doing. A lot of the National Science Foundation funding is going to this large types of programs. One particularly on lead to the University of Illinois where they need multi-disciplines to tackle this problem. And a physician alone is unable to do it or a chemist alone. One needs agronomists, hydrolysisists; it is a very complex problem. But we do have very definite concrete evidence, even in the local area. When the chemical data that is available suggests that there is in the roadside environment a marked increase in many things coming from particular traffic, lead is the easiest to demonstrate, for one has no trouble finding increased levels of Cadmium, which is a hypertensive agent; and a number of items that we would just as soon not have. I have mentioned one. One we don't even think about is asbestos, from the wearing of the brakes. This is something that all of us in urban areas will have

9
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Dr. Bowers(continued): and will find in our lungs; it is directly connected with carcinoma of the lungs - it causes a rare tumor that we never saw before in this country about 20 years ago a () and they are now quite common. The problems and the interaction between the thing that we have not known at all about - tire dust. It sounds funny. When I first talked about it, people laughed. They no longer laugh. I am consultant to The National Bureau of Standards in one of their divisions on Analytic Chemistry. When they told me about their problems of finding what tire dust really is. There are millions and millions of tons of what we wear off of our tires - we know nothing about its interaction with these highways. And yet, in my examinations of highways where there are highways running across reservoirs; and I have examined several of them - you can find these chips; not the dust perse, that is too small; but you have no trouble seeing tire chips all along it. We really don't know.

Now the whole question of what you would look for in a reservoir to show a interaction? Lead is the one I chose. And we have found it in increasing concentrations in the silt in the bottoms of reservoirs. Reservoirs are low-lying areas. They are not simply catch-basins for water. You can find marked increased in the sediment of lead, which comes from the tail-pipe. You can find other things like Cadmium. We have found these. You can also find this things (and I will leave these with you, because we have some documentation here) and these were drawn in conjunction with Mr. Woodhole, who is in charge of The Connecticut State Department of Health - Water. Mr. () of the Metropolitan District Commission, who was involved in the actual sampling. And also a biologist from Yale, because it involved botany here. We had no trouble getting the sediments on the bottom, but when it came to the identification of the plants; we need to make sure of their age and their growth cycle. In short, we were able to show that lead, supposedly an inert material; was not inert and was moving up through the food chains in terms of being in the plant life. So we really feel that there are many things that we know very little about and it would be very desirable to keep our highways well removed from water systems. This is the watershed as well as the physical reservoir.

Now, there are a number of people; and there is one very vivid illustration of what has happened. You may have read or heard that there are some people who are not particularly happy about their water in Farmington. There is a reservoir which lies below route 6, called the Wadsworth Reservoir. And people have complained about the oily taste; the unpleasant scum; and many others. These are statements from actual people. I know from contacts with physicians that call me at the hospital, that the people out there are very disturbed. They are trying to find out what is really going on. They need to only turn to the records that exist within the State Public Health, and you will find that with one exception, it has the highest chloride level of any reservoir in this state. A clear demonstration that the salt on the highways - the rain water and all, passes it off in

10
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Dr. Bowers(continued): to a reservoir. What else passes? Well, it so happens that this Wadworth Reservoir has the highest level of lead of any place in the state that I know of, at present. 15 micrograms per liter, that is well below the standard that is set for () water, but it is the highest I know of in Connecticut and we have very excellent water. When we put highways next to water systems, we do things that I am not too sure are correct for the biological system that we are. And I would say that it is an area of very complex - a growing interest in science. And in the next few years we are going to find out how wrong we have been to neglect this interaction - the car that we all love so, does so many things for us; does many things to us that we don't recognize. I will leave this as a document for you.

Rep. Frate: Are you concerned with all highways in the state of Connecticut that are near reservoirs?

Dr. Bowers: I am speaking specifically about this one, in endorsing the bill. But this is a statement that says all highways and you will find in there-----

Rep. Frate: What is it about this one in particular? Because I happen to live in the other end of the state and the Merritt Parkway runs next to the Stamford Reservoir. And I have been drinking that water for close to 60 years - and at least I think I am healthy. And I just wondered why it was this particular water that you are concerned about?

Dr. Bower: I think that the question of whether one is healthy or not is one of the quality of your health and the answer we can give you is whether you would be healthier were you in a healthier environment? I think that is the whole environmental quality. May I take a moment to tell what I think the environmental quality is? We have in our laboratory (I run the laboratory at Hartford Hospital) and we have some 60 people in it, in chemistry. We have a very excellent supervisor of Endocrinology; and she is a girl who has been feeling very tired for the last few years. She does an excellent job. In measuring her blood lead versus as part of a large endocrinologic study - contrasting it with blood leads with people up on the island of Vinal Haven; we found that she had one of the highest. In our own group, and elsewhere. In ferretting out what actually happened and how she came about this - she was from European extraction and so was her husband. They loved their wines - and being an old Yankee, being brought up in an different atmosphere - I immediately said "you're obviously a bunch of wineos, and you have picked up the lead from the wine". This was not it at all. She was given a gift of a coffee mug, that was glazed with a very poor lead - and she was being made toxic by the coffee she drank, in the laboratory every day. Two months after this source was removed, this girl feels like an absolutely new person. She did not characterize herself, previously, any different from what you may have just described yourself. But, she now knows what a price she paid. That is a quality environment. And these are the things when we talk about quality

11
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Dr. Bowers(continued): environment in terms of bio-chemical terms; that are very hard and elusive to come by. But I feel confident, that putting highways near our water supplies is biologically not the way to go. It may be feasible economically. It may be nice in our transportation needs. But for biological needs the cell does not need a lot more lead and a lot of these other elements around it. So that I feel that there is a very real need - and that speaks to the need in the state, in general, as well as specifically. That we keep these highways removed from watersheds and water supplies. Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. Richard Custer: Mr. Chairman; Gentlemen; I am Town Manager of West Hartford. The Town Council of West Hartford has taken an official position in regard to the location of the proposed interstate 291. And to the extent that position is reflected in the proposed bill, 1041, we certainly would support it. With me today is our Mayor, Ellsworth Grant and he would like to tell you what the Council's position is.

Mr. Ellsworth Grant: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; I am Mayor of West Hartford. I think that the Town Council of West Hartford could endorse this bill. We are on record as of Sept. 30, 1969, with a resolution advising the highway department that the Council is opposed to the routing of I-291; this particular section, anyway; through the reservoir property. And, the position of the Council hasn't changed since that time. However, speaking personally; I have some qualms about this particular bill serving the purpose it is intended for. We did not ask Sen. Jackson to file this bill, and having served on the Governor's Environmental Policy Committee, it seems to me that there is a better piece of Legislation now before the Environment Committee which meets this problem head-on. It seems to me that this is kind of an () bill, referring to a specific highway and a particular location. And I like the bill and I am sorry that I can't give you the number - because I didn't have enough time to prepare for this. But, I like the bill, which says in effect "that before a highway anywhere in the state of Connecticut can be constructed through open-space or endanger open-space or effect the environment in any way; that it must be carefully reviewed; and I think approved specifically by the Legislature". And, this is a Senate bill and I commend it to you as a preferable bill in principle than this particular one.

Rep. Holdridge: Question to Mr. Grant pertaining to the long-range studies that have been made concerning 291 and why are the people just now are questioning the routing.

Mr. Grant: Well, of course, the routing of I-291 has been under discussion for about 12 years. When it first came to the attention of the town of West Hartford; I have to admit that the particular route was approved by the Council at that time. Now in the year

12
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mr. Grant(continued): between, you have seen of course, a tremendous interest developed in the environment and ecology in general. And when the public, in effect, demanded the re-consideration of this route; through West Hartford and Bloomfield, the whole subject was opened again and there was a public hearing in West Hartford in the fall of 1969. At which there was a tremendous turn-out, mostly in opposition to this route going through the reservoir. So, it became a new "ball game"; with a new set of conditions.

Chairman Miscikoski: Any other questions?

Rep. Holdsworth: I don't quite follow you, sir, in the new set of conditions. True enough there has been a tremendous emphasis placed on ecology and so forth, but what are the new conditions?

Mr. Grant: Just to give you one fact; Dr. Foote, our State Health Commissioner, came out and said clearly and emphatically that "no state highway should be placed within a quarter of a mile of an existing water supply". It should be at least a quarter of a mile away; now, this is his contention. And, this, of course was in direct opposition of what the highway department wanted to do. This has been, perhaps, at the "heart" of the controversy. Right.

Rep. Holdsworth: This was "after the fact". And our Health Commissioner has stepped into the act "after the fact" rather than "before the fact"?

Mr. Grant: In this particular case.

Chairman Miscikoski: Anyone else in favor of this bill?

Mrs. George Meade: I live in Bloomfield. I want to answer to the remark that was mentioned a few moments ago, apropos of why wasn't there any fight about this before. We fought it with tooth and toenail, from 1959-on. When it was first proposed. We tried to find maps. We did our utmost to ascertain what damage this would do. When we finally got maps showing the propose route, they had a spur going right in an "S", across reservoir 6. Now, that is certainly not free of the water supply. That is our "holding" reservoir - it serves over 400,000 people, for drinking water. And this is important. Also, a great deal has been learned in the 12 years since this controversy first began as to the terrible harm that can come; and the more cars that go, naturally the greater deposit of lead, silt and tire dust. All those things are multiplied a hundred-fold and the prognosis of the cars that would pass over this highway, this polluting the reservoir, was just unbelievable. It was so tremendous in comparison to what was envisioned in 1959 and 60. And, I just want to quote one little thing, it won't take a moment. One morning I opened the morning paper, and I can't help it, I can't tell you the date; but it was last spring. And here was two columns over here; "Highway Commissioners see no danger (this was after

13
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mrs. Meade (continued): one of the public hearings) of over-turning trucks polluting the reservoir". That was a whole big, two columns, there. Over here, it says: "Two critically injured in firey crash as fuel truck flips off of I-84". Well, there you have it - right beside it, each other in the newspaper. And this is a terrible thing; this controversy about this highway has been going on too long. If it went any of the places that it goes now, it would take some of the finest taxable property in the whole county. And, if the state is looking for money, there would be a good way of not to lose any. Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Anyone else like to speak in favor? S. B. 1041.

Mr. Lauchlin McLean: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; I had the honor of serving on the Town Council at the time the Council adopted the resolution that Mayor Grant presented to you in which the town of West Hartford went on record as opposing the location of I-291 through the Talcott Mountain Reservoir land. I want to commend Sen. Jackson and the Legislature for taking an interest in this subject. I think that it is a proper matter for Legislative action. Perhaps, as a general rule, Legislatures should not involve themselves in specific routes; but, I must frankly say, that there are people in the highway department who have stubbornly clung to the concept of putting I-291 through the Talcott Mountain Reservoir land. And, this is in spite of the overwhelming logic and persuasion of positions against that. It took "politicians"; and I am using that word in the best sense of the word. Politicians who were sensitive to the views of the people and the changing values and concerns in our society, to finally put a reign on the people on the highway department. I am referring specifically to Governor Meskill and Congressman Daddario, in the last election. This highway has been under planning for 12 years. It is time that it should be re-examined, and re-justified. And, frankly, we are just having trouble getting the highway department to do that.

As I said, the Council in West Hartford is on record against this going through the Talcott Mountain Reservoir land. I think that I have to disagree with my friend, Mayor Grant; that the West Hartford Council ever took a position which approved that route. I have examined the record very closely and I find no official action by the town of West Hartford at any time that ever approved that route. That is Council action. But the Town Planner may have told the highway department - I don't know. But the Council never took a position in favor of that route. It is officially on record as against it. Now, before we irrevocably commit this land to destruction, what little remains of the open space, close in to Hartford on the west side; these plans have to be re-examined in the light of the values which have changed in our society the 12 year period. This part of a bigger picture. It is part of the concern of man destroying his natural environment. Destroying his own life. We are beginning to learn. Or at least the desirability of living that life. We concerned about the pollution of air and water. We are concerned

14
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mr. McLean(continued): about them to a degree that didn't exist 12 years ago, when they planned this highway. People are willing to absorb transportation inconvenience. They are willing to consider mass transportation, in order to preserve these close in places; so that we can get away, at least have some place to get away from the confines of urban life. I just want to ask you a question - "what is it worth to go out to this lovely green strip on a quiet Sunday afternoon, and take a quiet stroll?" It sure worth a lot more now than it was 12 years ago. And, you can bet your life, 12 years from now, it will be worth even more. This is what we have got to preserve. If we build this highway through this reservoir land, that lovely place won't ever be there again. And no highway department official can ever restore it. What we will have is a roaring highway down between two patches of green. And, I am confident that we will be found wanting, in the eyes of future generations. If we do this. You have heard from Dr. Bowers on the health question, so I won't address myself to that.

The Highway Department is now planning, and as I understand it, may even be buying land for a new proposed route 10 in the Farmington Valley and the flood plain. This is 2 miles west and essentially parallel to I-291. If that route 10 were connected with the I-91, Bradley Field connector; we'd have a highway that would perform the same by-pass functions of I-291. We don't need two super-highways within 2 miles of each other. I say to you, Gentlemen, that we are really at a turning point in history, we have got to preserve this earth of ours as a decent place to live. I think, therefore, that this is a proper bill before you. That this is a proper matter for legislative action and I urge you to preserve this land as an eternally legacy to our children and future generations. Thank you.

Rep. Holdsworth: Mr. Chairman, May I ask a question? Have you people submitted any alternate to the highway Commissioner for the alleviation of the traffic problem?

Mr. McLean: Yes, there have been several alternatives submitted, one which Mayor Grant and I both have joined in subscribing to. Perhaps I should place that in the record. This has appeared in the newspapers. It was presented orally at the hearing in West Hartford and I have reduced it to a drawing.

Rep. Holdsworth: What was the latest hearing? And have you had any meetings with the highway department of recent vintage?

Mr. McLean: There have been literally hundreds of meetings. Mrs. Kitowski, who spoke earlier, keeps a closer touch with the exact number; but there have been many, many meetings.

Rep. Holdsworth: You have no idea when the latest one was? The reason I ask - there has been a change in Administration, of course The new Deputy Commissioner of Highways is now Mr. George Koch,

14
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Rep. Holdsworth(continued): who was formerly the Chief of Design, and I would think that you would continue your exploration and I don't realize I was lucky or not; but I have had very good results, in meeting with Mr. Koch.

Mr. McLean: Mr. Koch is very well aware of our position and he has heard all of our arguments. He has had everything submitted to him that has been prepared by us that has been relative. I am afraid that Mr. Koch is one of these people whose mind we have had a hard time changing.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you, sir. Anyone else to speak on the bill?

Mr. Dennis Jones: I am not here to make a statement for or against this bill, or the statement of purpose, as we received it; but directly related to the question of I-291, we would like to submit for your consideration, again, our "Declaration of Commitment by CRPA to the Furtherence of Mass Transit".

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you very much. Anybody else?

Mr. Gilbert Lebowitz: Gentlemen; I am a member of the West Hartford Town Council. This is the third hearing on this project that I have appeared at, as a participant; and one our Town Council held a hearing. I find it - when I first got into this, I was not totally convinced of the feasibility of relocating or the necessity of relocating. However, I relied heavily on what Dr. Bowers has had to say; I've heard him at all three of these hearings. I have heard Dr. Foote speak on this issue and I have been tremendously impressed with their concern about the discussion of a very valuable natural resource. That is our water supply on the MDC property. Now, it is my feeling that just because a decision was made 12 years ago, that doesn't mean that the decision was correct. I think that we now find that because of advances in knowledge about the environmental problems - if we find that that decision was not the proper decision - we ought to change it before we become unalterably committed to it. The comment regarding the highway department, I think that one of the problems there is that they are committed pretty much to a policy or decision that was made 12 years ago. Hopefully, a change in the Administration in that Department will be helpful in bringing about a change in the thinking. And just one last comment; I would like to say that I concur with the proposal that Mr. McLean outlined a minute ago; that instead of building this road that the route 10 connector serve the purpose for which this roadway is designed. And that is to carry the traffic around Hartford to I-91, north of Hartford, up towards the northern Connecticut area. Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you. Senator Houley?

Senator Houley: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and thank the audience for your indulgence. I'll remark for roughly thirty

15
mr

Senator Houley(continued): seconds; specifically on S. B. 1386, 1387, 1388, 1390, 1402, 1403, 1404 and 1537. There are other people, Gentlemen, who will testify in greater depth, in reference to specific problem areas, that generalizing, I wish not only to call to the attention of this Committee on Transportation, but further, to the Department of Transportation; which I know you work closely with. Specifically, Rep. Locke, and the First Selectman of Stafford, are present. They will comment. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Rockville is present, and they will comment. The sub-committee of the Chamber will comment in detail. The Traffic Authority, Chief Edmund Dwyer of the Vernon Police will comment. So, let me make an all inclusive comment with reference to those areas that we are identifying here: Ellington, Stafford Springs, Tolland, Rockville, Vernon and I don't think we are over-looking any one. Gentlemen; for too long, in my opinion, has the state of Connecticut neglected its obligations in that particular area by the way of signalization, road improvements, road straightening; and some of these bills are intended to simply high-light that inadequacy. The roads were designed some 15 to 25 years ago, in a time when that area had a grand total of some 35,000 people. It now numbers 105,000 people, and continually growing. Four of the towns in that area have the highest per capita growth factor over the last decade in the state of Connecticut. So, I ask you when you, in Executive Session, evaluate these things - please give reasonable considerations to some of the areas that are identified here. It is imperative to the people living in that area. Its something that is conducive to the public safety of any number of Connecticut, especially the people living in that area; that we get into some of the signalizations that we can document and no doubt will be documented - were accident, after accident, after accident occurs. And I submit that there is a responsibility on the part of state of Connecticut to meet its obligation. And, I know that you will give it every consideration. Thank you for your indulgence.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you, Senator. One more, Rep. Locke, please

Rep. Locke: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; I would like to speak in favor of 1386 and 1388. I will just turn this over for about 30 seconds to our First Selectmen, Mr. Benjamin () who will explain them briefly.

First Selectman, Stafford: Mr. Chairman; I am speaking S. B. 1386 and 1388. Briefly, on 1386; this is route 32 running from Storrs, Mansfield, Willington to Stafford. For many years, since the time when I served in the Legislature; a small section of this road has been repaired, over a period of years through the efforts of the various Legislatures. There is one last section, and that is from Ellington to the center of Stafford Springs is in dire need of repair to make this a complete and useable highway. The route from Stafford south to the shore. We have a lot of traffic, it is a bottle-neck for traffic, during the summer. I ask your indulgence and consideration of this bill. S. B. 1388 deals with route 611 in the town of Stafford, it has been on the list of highway priorities, and each year it drops

16
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

First Selectman(continued): to a lower priority. And it has been listed by the highway department for completion but because of the lack of funds each year, it has been moved ahead and moved ahead. We ask that your Committee consider 611, it is a dangerous intersection and a dangerous curve at our highschool. We feel that it deserves and warrants your consideration. Thank you very much.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you, sir. We will go back to S. B. 1041.

Mrs. Kathy Wolf: Thank you. I am a Representative from West Hartford to the Capitol Region Planning Agency, and I didn't know Mr. Jones was here, but I would just like to reiterate what has already been said in the areas of environmental qualities and recreational facilities. But in particular, I would like to comment that CRPA took its position and has re-assessed its priorities on transportation, because increasing instances of this kind of highway problem, and because you are a Transportation Committee and not a highway committee, I presume that your concern is for alternatives, as ours is. I would just like to emphasize our really massive concern now, with looking at alternatives to automobiles and highway traffic; CRPA is now giving top priority to considerations of mass transit, and I think that unless the citizens of Connecticut, also give this kind of priority, I think that we are not only going to spoil our environmental qualities, but anyone who has tried to find a parking space to come to these hearings; is aware of urban problems as well as open-space problems. Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you. Anyone else care to be heard?

Mr. Douglas Reichlin: I live in Bloomfield and I am in favor of the bill and oppose the highway, vehemently. So does the Environmental Group at Bloomfield High School. I think that the highway poses a real threat to the water supply. I do know that the salt, which accumulates in the winter has to go somewhere. And it is that, plus the lead, that was mentioned before; and the sediment and all the other toxic chemicals which land on highways. I think that interstate highways and recreation are not compatible. I am sure that literally thousands of people use that area for hiking, bike riding, and for just enjoying the out doors, and I don't think that is compatible with a huge interstate highway there. I don't know how many of you enjoy walking, but when you want to get out for a quiet walk and you have an interstate highway next to you, I don't think it is much fun. And, there are not that many areas left near Hartford and I don't think that Bushnell Park is a very peaceful place. And this is a semi-wild place, and it is nearby and I think that its got to be kept away from highways. And the other thing, the highway will remove many houses and many people can not afford to move away when their house becomes displaced, when their house becomes in the path of an interstate highway. And, the other thing, I think that the government has to stop catering to the

17
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mr. Reichlin(continued): people who use automobiles. We just have to stop building highways and people will stop driving, when they find that it is not easy for them to drive. As most of you know, the car contributes 60% of the air pollution. And if the government continues to encourage this - we are just going to destroy ourselves. The traffic problem will take care of itself. The more we build highways, the more people will drive. The less highways we build; the more people will take busses. I think that we ought to have a decision about this very soon because I know it has been opposed for 12 years, and every time the highway department is prolonged its decision. Eventually the opposition may de-fuse out - people are just getting tired of coming to hearings, year after year. And that's all I 'd like to say. Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you. Anyone else in favor of S. B. 1041?

Mr. Homer Scott: I live in West Hartford. I would like to speak in favor of 1041 and also at the same time, 336, the Trout Brook Connector; in this regard. For years we have had these two routes hanging like the sword Damocles over us. Fighting, arguing, all kinds of back and forth changing of plans. From the point of view of long range planning, it is necessary that these routes be nailed down or that the highway be abandoned. It seems to me that I can support all the objections that the environmental arguments here. But I would like to point to one other thing, if we put I-291 up across the reservoir area, those of you who have driven Avon Mountain in the winter known what the icy conditions are like on the top, And if you are going to put a high speed, heavy traffic commuter route, right through that icy area, the people who design that and build that should be concerned with their own responsibility for what might happen to the people that will have to drive that route, in the future under adverse weather conditions. It seems to me that this is a responsibility which no one involved with the averall planning should ignore. I would suggest that this route gave the state of Connecticut a chance to have its own "S. S. T." program. Nobody thought that the S. S. T. could be stopped. Congress stopped it In spite of the investment that is there.

We have waited 12 years. We have fought for 12 years. And it seems that now the state of Connecticut has a chance. Does the Legislature here have the courage which the Legislature in Washington had? Will it look at the issue? Will it come up with new solutions? And will it give Connecticut a better future? Thank you.

Chairman Miscikoski: Thank you. Anyone wish to speak on this bill?

Mrs. John Lewis: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee on Transportation; I live in West Hartford and I speak as a citizen interested in clearing up this whole matter, once and for all. Th State Highway Department has a vested interest in building high ways - its their job. Nobody else, it seems, has a vested inte

18
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Mrs. Lewis (continued): in helping the citizens. I think that more people should come forth and do this. I have lived in West Hartford since 1956, and in that time I have had ample opportunity to observe the environmental degradation that is worked by a major, super-highway. I live within two blocks of I-84, the Park Road connector. And I can tell you, it has not enhanced the open space of that area. I am concerned about the noise. I am concerned about the loss of open space and I am concerned about the purity of the water. And I think that there are a number of valid arguments to support my concern. It is obvious to me in the years that I have lived in West Hartford, that highways generate traffic. People tend to build companies and plants along their routes, and you have an increase in traffic. A proliferation of highways simply enables us to go on increasing the number of automobiles, which adds to our problem. And, if it is possible for the Legislature to straighten this out and see that the highway does not go through open space land that is of great value, I think that it would be a fine idea. Thank you.

Mrs. Albert Babcock: I am Chairman of Land and Water Resources Committee of the West Hartford League of Women Voters. The 60 Leagues in Connecticut represent over 6,000 women. After a detailed study, they support comprehensive, long range planning for land and water use. Conservation; preservation of open space development of water resources; and improvement of water quality. The forest land of the reservoir owned by the Metropolitan District Commission is West Hartford's only major wilderness available for the purpose of conservation and public recreation. We are concerned with this portion of I-291 which is planned for this particular section of land. The League urges the Committee of Transportation to give serious consideration to the following: In the light of recent developments in the study of ecology, what effect would the proposed highway have on the balance of plant and animal life in this area? The proposed highway will abut or cross portions of the reservoir system, and we are concerned that the quality of our drinking water would be impaired by the drainage, accidents, exhaust fumes and litter. Can the highway guarantee that its proposed safeguards be adequate to prevent pollution - both now and with the future increase in traffic? I think that the answer to that is obviously no. Will the new Department of Transportation be studying alternative means of solving future traffic needs? Such as a mass transit system? If a mass transit system for the Greater Hartford area is developed, will the proposed highway be necessary? And is the proposed highway the best answer for the future use of this land? I think that the answer is obviously no. Thank you.

Miss Nicole Lurie: I live in Bloomfield, and a gentlemen stated before that he had been to 3 hearings about the highway. And I can't remember if I have been to 4, 5 or 6; but I know that at each one the people who came out against the highway and the number of people who have been interested, has declined. Up to

19
mr

TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 30, 1971

Miss Lurie(continued): now, I think that I have had reasonable faith in the "due process"; reasonable faith in the "democratic process"; but at this point I would like to say that I am really scared that what is going to happen is that we are going to have enough hearings, until nobody shows up - then the highway is going to get pushed through. And people are going to say; "see nobody opposed it". I would like to say that I support this bill, just for this reason alone, at this time. I think we've got it in this controversy now - because people are just starting to give up - to give up hope - that faith in fighting; starting to give up hope, altogether.

Chairman Miscikoski: Anyone else? No one else wants to speak on 1041. The highway department has given a statement on 1041.

We will go on to S. B. 1386 An act concerning reconstruction of route 32 from Ellington to Stafford Springs. Anyone to speak on this bill? The highway department have a statement?

We will go on to S. B. 1387 AN ACT CONCERNING INSTALLATION OF A TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL AT ROUTES 74 AND 30 IN TOLLAND.

Mr. Richard Rose: Gentlemen; it nice to see you again. I am from the Chamber of Commerce of the Rockville area. Our Chamber represents Vernon, Ellington and Tolland. Sen. Houley paraphrased the bill today. This is the first one by number that has come up. This is an intersection that will represent the first stop light - a real milestone in the town of Tolland. And the town of Tolland wants it. The intersection is particularly hazardous. It is aggravated by a potential problem in that one of only two fire houses in the large geographic area of Tolland is located at this intersection. At the bend of route 30 where it heads towards Crystal Lake. We have had an accident's history here, I don't have specifics on that. All the other bills I want to address myself to, later today. We have our Chairman of Safety from Vernon, most of them are located in Vernon. I would like to see a stop light at this intersection. We know that this is a difficult financial year; we think that we are thinking small. A stop light doesn't seem like much to ask for.

Chairman Miscikoski: Anyone else like to speak on S. B. 1387? Anyone opposed?

Mr. Rocco Laraia: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee; I am from the Dept. of Transportation. I would like to speak on S. B. 1387, 1402, 1403 and 1404; all of these pertain to traffic signals. As stated at previous hearings, it is the feeling of the Department that the determination of installation of traffic signals should remain with the State Traffic Commission. S. B. 1387 would direct the Commissioner to install a traffic control signal at the intersection of routes 78 and 30 in Tolland. In accordance with a request received, a study was completed in July of 1969 at this location wherein it was determined that

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

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

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

35.

to the Senate. This is an item that we passed earlier.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection. Hearing none, the rules are suspended.

Is there objection to transmittal. Hearing none, Cal. 1586 is transmitted.

THE SPEAKER:

Good morning, Representative Ajello.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Good morning, sir. The sun has come up. (Lights from the T.V. camera) On Page 5, I request the Clerk to call Cal. 1438.

THE CLERK:

At the bottom of Page 5, Cal. 1438, Sub. for S.B. 1041.

AN ACT CONCERNING INTERSTATE ROUTE 291 IN WEST HARTFORD. F. 1413.

THE SPEAKER:

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Hartford, Representative Clark.

MR. CLARK: (14th)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

MR. CLARK: (14th)

Mr. Speaker, I understand there is an amendment.

roc

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

36.

THE SPEAKER:

Clerk in possession of Amendment Schedule A?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, offered by Mr. King of the 37th and Mr. Lowell of the 38th. In line 8 add a period after Hartford. Delete the words, nor to the east of said reservoirs or dike pond provided - capitalize the I in the word if.

MR. CLARK: (14th)

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment. In a few words I will say it would emasculate the intent of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on adoption of Amendment A. Will you remark further. Representative King.

MR. KING: (37th)

Mr. Speaker, I move for passage of the amendment. This amendment deals with a very narrow portion of this bill. For a long time a lot of controversy arose out of construction of I-291 which proceeds on the westerly side of the outer rim of Hartford and into the suburbs in a northerly direction. Everything I believe is ironed out, as a matter of fact I am in accord with everything that this bill says actually except for the portion which would require that the road not be constructed to the east of one reservoir and that is reservoir number six. All this amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is to permit the road to be constructed to either the east or the west of this reservoir number six and there are safeguards in here which go further and

roc

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

37.

say subjectto, provided that the it shall be subject to the approval of the State Health Department. Now, the reason that I have the amendment is because the State Highway Department currently plans to build the road to the east of reservoir number six. I am familiar with that reservoir. It is one of my favorite running places. I have run around it literally hundreds of times. It's about 4½ miles around. And the significant thing about it is this and this is why I oppose it to being build to the west. The reservoir, below the reservoir, where the Highway Department intends to build it, it s very considerably downgrade. If it goes to the west of the reservoir, there is a real danger because the slope is like that, oil or any highway pollution is a danger to a reservoir, certainly it will be so if this is constructed on the upper side, on the west side. A second reason is this reservoir is fed by pipes of the Neapaug Reservoir and if a road were to be constructed to the west of the reservoir, it would have to be constructed over these feeder pipes. That certainly seems like a tremendous occasion for pollution to occur. One more important item, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. This highway is now under such a state of design, I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, if you would attempt to get attention again.

THE SPEAKER:

I will try again and I especially urge our guests in the gallery, it is noticeable here at the rostrum, that considerable noise is coming from upstairs. Members and guests, please. I would indicæ that we have an hour and a half to go

roc

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

38.

with considerable business. The gentleman from the 37th.

roc

MR. KING: (37th)

Very briefly, there is only one more phase I want to explain about this in addition to the pollution which I have done. The last item I will go into is simply this fact. The highway is presently under such a state of highway design and planning, I have letters here from the Highway Department that say that if this road should mandatorily by the Legislature be forced to go to the west, they would have to start their design plans again and they simply do not have time to do so because in order to get the 90% Federal funding, which they will get under this highway, they will have to have construction under way by summer of 1975.

THE SPEAKE:

Will the House come to order. Will the members please be seated. The staff please come to the well of the House. Members please be seated. Once they are, we will resume the debate. Representative King.

MR. KING: (37th)

read a
I will read a paragraph from a letter dated May 17, from the Transportation Department. One paragraph. The 4-year interval between the present ~~date~~ and the deadline would not allow time to select a tentative new corridor, obtain Federal approval of the revised line, hold a public hearing on the location of the corridor, hold another public hearing on design details, acquire the property, relocate the occupants of the dwellings and businesses,

demolish the abandoned structures and complete the innumerable details essential to a final set of construction plans and specifications. They go on, they estimate that the total Federal funds, if this proceeds according to the Federal specifications, the total Federal funds for which they expect reimbursement being 90% total up to \$200 million. Actually its \$215 million. This may not be accurate because they are not certain how much funds they would lose as to each successive stage of this highway. For example, the stack has already been built. I think those figures run into something like \$29 million, already been built for the stack. The property has been acquired where this road will run if it continues to go east of the reservoir, where the Transportation Department plans to construct it. So I urge you, and I would point out this, that if this reservoir should go to the east and this amendment will ^{allow} it to do and as the Transportation Department, I believe plans to put it, it would not tear up any residential district or business district. I don't know the distance but I would estimate that it would go through approximately, well probably several thousand feet of a strip of West Hartford which does have some homes in it, I can see if from the road, but it is only an occasional home.

THE SPEAKER:

I respectfully urge the gentleman to attempt to bring remarks to conclusion. We have at least 15 more items available, double-starred, that we should reach this evening. I know how

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

40.

important this item is to the gentleman. We have other business to attend to. roc

MR. KING: (37th)

I shall conclude immediately, Mr. Speaker. I would only say this. I want to state to you, where Farmington stands in this. This isn't even in my town. This involves Avon or West Hartford. It is important to me because of principle and because if this road should be stopped, it is going to have to go somewhere, someday and the Transportation Department assures me they will be without the Federal funds. And I don't want to stop, I don't want to divert it and go directly through the center of Farmington Village or up in that direction. I think there is open land here. A route has been chosen and I think that we would be wise to continue with that rather than to stop this matter and not know what we have done.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Amendment A. Rep. Hannon.

MR. HANNON: (16th)

Mr. Speaker, I think the words of admonishment of the Speaker are quite in order. We have about an hour and twenty minutes to conclude the calendar. I would like to speak ever so briefly on this and offer my congratulations to the entire delegation from West Hartford both Senate and House members. You have done, sirs, what I have failed to do. Your companion of 291 was very close and near and dear to us in East Hartford in our fight for I-86. I do not accept the amendment. I

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

41.

will vote to reject the amendment and wish you well, in the passage of this bill and hope it is signed by the Governor of the State of Connecticut.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Tudan of the 42nd.

MR. TUDAN: (42nd)

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly concur with a remark or two made by Representative King. The highway is not going through Farmington. As a matter of fact the other sponsor of the bill, he's about ten more miles removed from this highway out there in Canton. Now we're concerned with the Towns of Bloomfield, Newington and West Hartford and Windsor. These are the people that are vitally concerned with this measure. I have more to say on the bill. I oppose this amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Lenge of the 13th.

MR. LENGE: (13th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. This is a battle of I-291 and this is a line on which it has to end. I stand to oppose the amendment. Unfortunately, time has run out. It is of paramount interest not only to West Hartford but to the Greater Capital Region, It involves the beltway. It involves ecological problems. The blind is wrong. If you take this out and if you support this amendment, you kill the bill. You know what the hour is and it can't go back to the Senate. I urge you to defeat the amendment and let's pass the bill.

roc

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

42.

roc

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Lowell of the 38th.

MR. LOWELL: (38th)

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the problem here is if this amendment is not passed, the road will not be built. For those who do not want the road built that is understandable. The problem of the road involves safety on I-84 and I-91. It takes the strain off the conjunction of these two roads in Hartford and allows traffic to flow around them, thus being a safer area. The cost is extreme, if this bill is passed, the only thing I can say is 291 will not be built. We have to have this amendment so that we can go forward and have 291 and I will speak on the bill later on.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. AMENDMENT IS LOST.

Will you remark on the bill. Representative Clark.

MR. CLARK: (14th)

Mr. Speaker, ecologically and environmentally, socially, and many other reasons, I think this is a good bill. It simply tells, the people are telling what cannot be done by the Highway Department. Urge passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill. Rep. Lowell.

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

43.

MR. LOWELL: (38th)

roc

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the bill itself, we now come to the question of the bill which even with the amendment I would oppose, primarily because we are going into new areas for the Legislature. The Legislature, if they pass this bill, now starts to go into highway design. If you feel as members of this House that the Legislature should have an engineering department to determine whether the road should be built or not, then passing this bill takes us into the area of highway design and I think that is the first reason why we should not pass this bill. Secondly, this bill goes into the area of home rule. There is no reason why anyone except the representatives from West Hartford, Windsor, Bloomfield and Wethersfield would have any interest or any knowledge as to whether anyone of us here speaking on this particular issue is telling you the truth or actually has any verification of their facts. 291 as located on the map is just east of a large mountain cliff. To move it to the west which this bill now says means not a movement of several hundred feet or several thousand feet but several miles. This destroys the value of relieving the pressure on the center, the convergence of 84 and 91 in the center of Hartford. For those people in Hartford to relieve the pressure on this very dangerous set of highways, 84 and 91, this particular bill will continue for another 20 years this condition without relief. Mr. Speaker, I think we have gone into a very serious question of legislative prerogatives and I would advise and ask all members to consider

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

44.

seriously this question in voting for and against and I would ask all to oppose this particular bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Lenge.

MR. LENGE: (13th)

Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I can't agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Canton. This is a very critical issue not just for West Hartford but for the whole state and in particular the Greater Hartford Region. The beltway is conceived, the beltway is built and all of the social and economical factors are at stake. If this is a monument to ineptitude or improper planning in the past, nothing in the world says that we have to be stuck with it. There is a decision to be made here and it ought to be made. And perhaps maybe by doing it, we are serving notice that from here on in it ought to be done right.

THE SPEAKER:

Representative Donnelly from the 46th.

MR. DONNELLY: (46th)

Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, to say that I too also disagree with Mr. Lowell. As we have said many times here in this Chamber, it is high time that the people speaking through this Body, told the highway department how they are doing it wrong and where they are doing it wrong. And in addition, two weeks ago, in our Town of South Windsor, there was a corridor hearing on the eastern terminus of I-291, this same highway. I would like to issue a call in this Chamber now to the Transportation

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

45.

roc

Commissioner to devote the funds that will be delayed because of what Mr. King said to that portion of the road in East Hartford, South Windsor and Manchester.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. The gentleman from the 37th.

MR. KING: (37th)

Speaking in opposition to this bill. Mr. Speaker, I regret taking this time but this bill has languished on this calendar for days and held up for political trades for some reasons or other and I think that I should be given an opportunity and anyone else to explain something as important as this to the State of Connecticut and the entire Capital Region. Now, it is too bad, regrettable that people are trying to confuse this and say that Mr. Lowell and myself are making, are promoting something which would be detrimental to the environment. The converse of this is true. I explained that and I won't go into details of it again. But there is a lot at stake here. I am surprised that people from West Hartford would get up at this last moment and rely entirely upon emotion rather than logic. If this is going to stop 291, this is one thing and this will, unless our Governor vetoes it. The facts are simple, there are deadlines to be met. We are not trying to put this road through any congested district, we are trying to put it where the highway department has planned and it has nothing to do with the lower portions of those reservoirs. The route that it now takes

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

46.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

roc

Mr. Speaker, point of order. The gentleman is imposing on us. He has already made these arguments. I allowed him to continue on the amendments when he was talking about the bill. I insist that he stick to the subject or sit down.

THE SPEAKER:

I would urge the gentleman to complete his remarks so that we can go on to the other 15 or 16 Calendar items that are available for action this evening.

MR. KING: (37th)

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude. I realize that this is all futile. But I only do so in the recognition that I think an injustice has been done here tonight to the people of our State and to the Capital Region to have held this item up and not allow time for proper debate and for the apparent wish to hide the facts of this matter from the light of day.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. THE BILL IS PASSED.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, directing the Clerk's attention to Page 16, Cal. 1655.

THE CLERK:

Page 16, Cal. 1655, S.B.1830. AN ACT CONCERNING PARTICIPATION BY HOSPITALS IN THE HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AUTHORITY ACT.

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

June 1, 1971

27

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, there is another bill I would like to take up, move to take up out of order.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection? If not you may proceed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Perhaps Senator Jackson can help me find it.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Page 17, third from the bottom.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

I move that we take that up at this time., since there is no objection.

THE CLERK:

Page 17, third item from the bottom. Cal. 1015, File 1413. Favorable substitute report of the joint standing committee on Transportation on Substitute S.B. 1041 An Act Concerning Interstate Route 291 in West Hartford.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will You remark?

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, this bill does not repeal, nor does it delay a route. As other bills which appeared before this august body have. But rather this measure sets forth where the proposed highway may not go. It specifically avoids the reservoirs in the metropolitan district area. And keeps this highway, which is needed, from passing through these reservoirs. The bill sets forth in line 8 and so on, they shall not move to the east of

June 1, 1971

28.

these reservoirs and keeps them west. I'm trying to think of the map. West of the reservoir areas. And to avoid environmental protection problems. Pollution problems. Also the last part sets forth regulations that it shall not pass to the east of the last reservoir. I believe reservoir six. That's part of a problem with people and people's homes. We believe that this is a good bill again it's important to emphasize that this does not delay construction. It does not postpone construction. It merely says where the road should not go. It's a good bill. I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. I think that what Senator Mondani is very interesting. He said it merely means where roads cannot go. Well that of course tells you where it can go. And so what we're doing here for the first time at least to my knowledge. There maybe other instances. We are legislating, we are engineering from this capitol. We are moving into the engineering business. We are telling the Highway Department where to put roads. Now I am well aware of the political problems in this situation. And I am also aware of the ecological problems, the conservation problems. And I personally think that the original route of this bill was an incorrect one. But now by getting into the act here in this legislative body. We are in effect establishing a precedent which I think that all Senators should think about. You may not be involved in this particular bill. This may not be your town. But it could very well be your town in subsequent years. Another body up here may say we'll put the road through your town and legislate areas, engineering from this body. It's a mistake. It's a mistake to do this. Now this situation can be worked out without as a practical matter saying that this interstate highway shall be placed in a certain place.

June 1, 1971

29.

And no matter which way you slice it. Thats what your saying here. Your saying it can't be put here. Which leaves no alternative but to put it in another place. Its a dangerous precedent. Think about it carefully. And I hope you will vote no on it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I believe Senator Eddy has hit the nail on the head as to what the purpose of this bill is for. I obviously rise in support of the bill. Because I think it is accomplishing a very worthwhile and important service to the people of the state of Connecticut. Particularly in the greater Hartford area. I think we've come full circle from the day that the Highway Department could run rough shod over citizens, reservoirs, parks and anything else that it wanted to run over in its desire to run a straight line between two points. And I think that we have to make a decision as to whether we are going to grant all the power to the Commissioner and his Department. Or whether we should reserve here in the legislature. Because any power that the Commissioner has or his Department has comes from this legislature. And I believe we have a situation existing on Interstate 291, which shows very clearly efforts made in the past to avoid some problems that have created even greater problems. Until a band of very determined and dedicated environmentalists in West Hartford started a battle to save the reservoirs, the Highway Department was going to build 291 right over the top of some of the reservoirs in West Hartford. I think that they have abandoned this misguided attempt. But they are still determined to place the highway in my estimation, in a position which will do damage to the environmental beauty. To the conservation of the region. And also it is going to destroy many beautiful and valuable homes to the east of the reservoir.

June 1, 1971

30.

About fourteen years ago a political decision was made not to run 291 through the heart of West Hartford, which would have knocked down schools, and synagogues and churches. And I think five hundred homes. A political decision was made then to move the highway west. Unfortunately they didn't go far enough west and they landed right in the middle of the reservoir. And I think a political decision also has to be made here in this chamber, and I hope it will also have an opportunity to be made in the House of Representatives and finally by the Governor. To enact a political decision. Because I do not believe it is in the best interest of anyone to put the highway where the Highway Department now wants to place it. And the purpose of this bill is to ensure that the highway can be built in the future. But its going to have to be built higher up on the mountain. Where you have fewer homes. And where you are not going to unduly disrupt the environmental and the ecological balance of nature in the area.

I think we have important decision here. And I would hope that the Senate would take cognizance of the importance of that decision and vote yes on this bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Senator Crafts.

SENATOR CRAFTS:

Mr. President, members of the circle. I rise to oppose this bill. And associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from the 9th. I would point out that I-95 as it was constructed through Southeastern Connecticut, it was in fact constructed over the water reservoirs of the Town of Groton. It has proved to be no problem to the reservoirs of the town of Groton. And therefore I see no problems in in the construction of any other highway over any other reservoir. Now in the introduction of this bill. Remarks were made that there would be no delay, caused by this bill. I would like to point out to members of the circle that the engineering and the drafting, the drawing on the drawing boards do take a great deal of time. And to redraft

June 1, 1971

31.

and redesign would indeed delay the construction of this highway. I would ask that the members of the circle vote in opposition to this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hammer.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I rise to ask a question of the Senator from the 33rd District. I just want to know, does the present highway commissioner, as well as the previous highway commissioner approve of the presently planned location of this highway?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Through you Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge Senator, there are several. There was a proposed line and that line has again now been altered. And I believe a great deal of the bill that we are now considering is in the new proposed line. They had not established a definite line. But they did have a line that did cross over these reservoirs. And they've since developed a plan that complied a major, major portion of this act.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator MacAuley.

SENATOR MACAULEY:

Mr. President, members of the circle. Coming from a city where we now have a highway of progress which has destroyed probably one of the nicest part of the state. I just say that I wish a few years ago. Even last year, someone had put through a bill like this in behalf of our city.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

I think this issue before is really crucial as Senator Macauley pointed out. That last week we said no to construction. And we say no to postponement. We are saying that once the road

June 1, 1971 32.

is begun. It will never be changed. It can never be challenged. It rolls on and on. And we the first branch of government in this three part branch of government had no choice. We must accept. And I think its critical. And we've reached a critical point. That perhaps we should give more direction when we approve funds for road programs. Directions that would protect our environment. Directions in this case that would protect our public drinking supply. Directions which might protect homes. Moving people out. I think that this is the first time that we've seen many bills come before this session asking for haults, stops, delays, redesign of road programs. I would say that the people of this state are becoming concerned and we should become concerned. And again I urge adoption of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell, did you wish to be recognized before? Will you remark further? The question is on passage of the bill. All those in favor signify by saying aye./^{AYE}Opposed nay? NAY. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 8 please Cal. 910, File 1243. Favorable substitute report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations on Substitute S.B. 356. An Act concerning the Waiver of Tuition Fees of Needy Students at the Regional Community And Technical Colleges.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

I believe sir, with your permission, we are going to hold that and retain it until tomorrow.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk called it. If there is no objection we will pass retaining.

June 1, 1971

36.

honest decisions. I don't think anyone anytime has questioned that. And the simple fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the no fault proposal and its history in this session indicates that it was defeated. Now that's a fact. Now we can do two things here. We can accept that defeat and go about our merry way. And then revive it a year hence. Or we can take the alternative route, which is suggested in this bill. And appoint this committee. And hope that with their diligence and their study that they will come back with some recommendation that will enable no fault to become a reality in the state of Connecticut. And it is for that purpose, Mr. President, that I hope that the amendment would be passed. And I would hope that the bill itself also would be passed.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the amendment. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage of the amendment signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The amendment is adopted. Ruled technical. Senator Houley, will you remark further on the bill? Or will your remarks stand?

SENATOR HOULEY:

No further remarks, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Page 9,

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, as a member of the prevailing side, I would like to move for reconsideration of the Cal. 1015, File 1413 Substitute for S.B. 1041. Page 17.

June 1, 1971

37.

THE CHAIR:

Page 17.

SENATOR JACKSON:

This is an Act Concerning Interstate Route 291 in West Hartford.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on Reconsideration. Of the affirmative vote. You were on the prevailing side. On that bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR JACKSON:

I hope my motion is defeated.

THE CHAIR:

I am sure you all understand this now, including the freshmen. Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this motion. And when the vote is taken I'd like to have it taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

In other words when you saay you'd like to. You move for a roll call?

SENATOR EDDY:

I so move Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Two different things. A motion has been made for a roll call vote. Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

You want the move for a roll call vote first?

THE CHAIR:

Yes I would like to first. All those in favor of a roll call on the reconsideration signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? No. More than 20% having voted ayes there will be a roll call on Reconsideration of Cal. 1015, File 1413, Page 17.

Senator Ives.

June 1, 1971

38.

SENATOR IVES:

THE CHAIR:

I have already recognized Senator Ives. Do you rise for a point of Order? Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, I question your ruling on the vote on the last motion that declared to be 20%.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ives, would you sit down a minute. I get nervous when more than two are standing at one time.

All those in favor of a roll call signify by standing. Do you still question it Senator? The question is withdrawn.

Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to support the motion for reconsideration. I believe the Senator from the 9th that he hoped the motion was lost. But I think if he spoke against the bill, he should be speaking for, in favor of the motion to reconsider. I think..

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson spoke in favor of the bill.

SENATOR IVES:

But Senator Eddy spoke opposed. Mr. President, I think the matter should be brought back. I don't know whether theres a possibility of an amendment, but I think maybe we can take a roll call vote on the bill itself. If the motion to reconsider carried.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the motion to reconsider.

Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

I stand corrected by Senator Ives. I would like to have this bill reconsidered. So if I failed to make my position clear I am now doing so.

June 1, 1971

39.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? For the benefit of all of the members, Senator Jackson who was on the prevailing side on the passage of the bill concerning Interstate Route 291 which interdicted certain areas in which it may not go, has move to reconsider as a standard parlimentary maneuver. And he has said he hopes it is not reconsidered. That is if you wish to bring it up again. You will vote yes. If you wish to support Senator Jackson's view and put the bill to rest you will vote no.

Any further question before we have the roll call? Yes will bring the bill back to life. No will have it passed.

Right Senator Jackson. Did I make that clear?

The bill was passed in the first place and if reconsideration is defeated, it will remain passed.

Shall we begin the roll call.

Results of the votes on reconsideration. S.B. 1041

Whole number voting.....	35
Necessary for passage.....	18
Those voting Yea.....	17
Those voting Nay.....	18
Those absent and not voting.....	1

The bill will not be reconsidered.

THE CLERK:

Page 9 please. The first item. Cal. 918, File 1137, 792. Favorable sbstitute report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary. Substitute H.B. 5096 An Act Concerning Title to Air Space Over State Highways.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

S-83

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

VOL. 14

PART 8

1-468

SP.SESS

INDEX

August 2, 1971

78

DISTRICT	26	SENATOR RIMER	YEA
	27	STRADA	YEA
	28	RUDDLIF	YEA
	29	DUPONT	YEA
	30	POWER	NAY
	31	DINIELLI	YEA
	32	IVES	NAY
	33	MONDANI	YEA
	34	DENARDIS	YEA
	35	HOULEY	YEA
	36	FINNEY	YEA

The Chair:

The following is the Yea and Nay Vote

Whole Number Voting	34
Necessary for Passage	24
Those voting Yea	32
Those Voting Nay	2
Those Absent and Not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR SMITH:

I wish to vote yes.

THE CHAIR:

The bill is repassed. The veto is overturned.

THE CLERK:

There are two items to be taken up on Page 5. Please return to that page. Public Act 866. Sub. for Senate Bill No. 1041. An Act Concerning Interstate Route 291 in West Hartford.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Alfano, would you like to preside? Thank you.

SENATOR ALFANO IN THE CHAIR:

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, I move for repassage of the act.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President. We discussed this bill one warm night and at that time pointed out that the Transportation Committee reported this bill, it wasn't an effort to repeal or rescind funding but rather an effort on the part of this General Assembly when it saw fit to determine where the particular road may or may not go. The veto message, second paragraph our Governor has pointed out he feels that it is improper for the General Assembly to legislate where highways may or may not go. If we adopt this reasoning Mr. President, we should merely approve a budget for this Department of Transportation and let them pick where highways will go, over what route, through whose home, near what reservoir. I don't think it is improper, we were elected, we ran for office, we represent the people. We have chosen where a highway may not go. We haven't chosen to say where it may go. We haven't chosen to say where it may go. We have selected where it may not go because we don't want to displace people. We have said where it may not go because we are worried about reservoirs and public drinking water. I think it is our right and I think we are proper in making this choice. I notice in the last paragraph there is a statement about a campaign for governorship in the veto message. It really doesn't bear on the veto message. It is interesting to read it. But I don't know why this is the sole and exclusive prerogative of the Executive Branch of the Government of the State of Connecticut to choose where a highway

August 2, 1971

30

should or should not be placed. I think it is about time, the legislature take it upon itself to dictate when it sees the need, where a highway goes, when it is going through reservoirs, when it going through somebody's home, somebody who saved, who worked, saved for a whole lifetime to build this house. People are going to be displaced. Now we have made this choice and there are very few dissenting voices in this chamber and I say to the members in this Chamber right now that if you let the veto's stand and don't come later with your bills before the Transportation Committee and say that we don't want it there, we would rather not have it there. You are voting for the executive branch, in the Department of Transportation to select these places and then we are all through. We merely appropriate the funds, we appropriate the funds based on maps presented, based on needs and later if we see a change in the needs, we see a change in the routes, we should be able to dictate it from this branch. We must remember we are an equal branch and I urge this veto be overridden. We chose to do that, we chose to set a pattern on that one hot night in June and I would hope we would stick with this pattern and override this veto.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

I concur with the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Committee. He has joined the issue well and I believe the basic and fundamental background of this bill involves the power of the legislature with regard to one of it's agencies in the executive branch. Representative Owen Clarke from West Hartford and I introduced this bill because of our

August 2, 1971

81

SENATOR JACKSON:

feeling that the Transportation Department was making a tragic mistake by using the reservoir area of the MDC property in West Hartford as the corridor for interstate 291. In an effort to try and find out what the present thinking of the department is, I requested, and after some delay, Commissioner Wood and his staff came here to the Senate Chamber this morning and told us basically that Interstate 291 is going to go in approximately the same position as the original plan. There will be some minor shifting but in the same corridor area in a position south of Albany Ave of West Hartford, it will then proceed and run east of the reservoir, reservoir 6 in West Hartford. This is directly contrary to the wishes of this legislature in passing Senate Bill 1041, which directly specifies that the Highway shall not pass through, over or to the east of any of the reservoirs or (inaudible). The Commissioner says he will not respect the wishes of this legislature, the fact that the bill has been vetoed requires that it be overridden if we are to protect the interest of the people, not only of West Hartford, but of the greater Hartford Area. At the meeting this morning he said specifically that I-291 is still going through the entire length of the MDC property in West Hartford. It was still going to cut the town of Bloomfield in two with tragic consequences in my estimation and it is still going to cut across a good section of the town of Windsor.

I would point out to the members of this Circle that the Town Councils of Windsor, Bloomfield and West Hartford are going on record as against the present route. It is the same route with minor modifications and pro

SENATOR JACKSON:

as proof of that the Commissioner told me there would be no necessity for any new public hearings because it is in the same corridor. The shifting is so slight there will be no need for a new public hearing.

I think that we would have to understand that there was one other major factor built into the bill under discussion today and that is the requirement that wherever the highway is built, it will have the approval of the Commissioner of Health. I ask the Transportation Commissioner this morning what effect the denial of Commissioner Foote would have on the Route of Interstate 291 and he would not tell me that he would not put the road where Commissioner Foote did not want it to go. In other words, he would still take another hard look at the proposed route, but if he felt justified he would go ahead and build it where he presently intends to have it built, despite anything that Commissioner Foote might have to say.

One other factor that I think should be pointed out, is the fact that the passage of this bill and the override of this veto today would insure a complete reappraisal of the entire Transportation system and network, west, northwest and north of Hartford. This has not been done on a long range planning basis as the Commissioner has told me this morning. All they have done is to make some temporary plans to take care of the problem which is going to exist when Interstate 91 is enlarged by two lanes in the coming years. Now what is the reason for the Transportation Department rushing pellmell into approving approximately the same route. The only reason that I can see is that it is halfway valid, is the fact that it might cost some federal money and even here I don't think the Department of Transportation has been candid in some of its attempts to first

August 2, 1971

83

~~SENATOR JACKSON:~~

prevent the bill from being passed and interdepartmental message dated May 17, the Commissioner stated, and I quote "The Federal Highway Administration has notified all states that Federal allotments that finance interstate system projects will be withdrawn on any project not under construction contract on July 1, 1975. "This is simply not true. I have a letter from Mr. Turner, Division Engineer from the U.S. Department of Transportation which says the law does not mandate that all construction be completed. All it does require is that the construction be funded with interstate finance be authorized by July 1, 1975. So I submit there is ample time to run a new corridor and one which will not desecrate the M.D.C. land. In this same interdepartmental memo Commissione Wood points out that at the present time the Federal Government will pay 90% of the costs and he points out further and I quote "There is no question that a highway comparable to I 291 some day will be constructed and when it is the cost will be 100% obligation of the state and not 10% as currently provided. Commissioner Wood in his memo omitted the fact that there is 70% funding which is available under a different program. I think in all candor he should have pointed out this fact to the members of the legislature to whom this was addressed. I think this is simply an attempt to railroad the General Assembly into feeling that we are going to lose all these good federal funds. This is simply not the case under two counts. Our Transportation Committee chairman Seantor Mondani has pointed out that this is setting up a precedent in having the legislature dictate to the General Assembly, or dictate to the Dept. of Transportation. I don't really consider this as so because really we have been dictating where highways are going to be going. The only thing we are doing here is saying where

August 2, 1971

84

SENATOR JACKSON:

a highway shall not be built. For years the precedent has been set by telling the department where to build and I think we can now for the first time recapture some of the authority which has been given us as members of the General Assembly and we must remember that whatever power the Highway has it comes from this Circle and the House of Representatives on the second floor.

I believe that while there are many dedicated people in the Dept. of Transportation I think for too long the thinking has been, how can you build a road between two points and the straightest line without having regard for housing, synagogues, churches, schools and anything else which happens to lie in its way. In this particular instance, we have a beautiful reservoir area one of the last areas in Greater Hartford which has not been spoiled by urban development. I would ask before it is too late to evaluate our control over the situation and repass this bill. This morning the Commissioner said that the slight shifting of lines will make it so the new road as planned will not pollute the water. This statement threw off hours of painstaking, scientific research and also other testimony that we are going to possibly have problems with pollution of water and all the noise and dirt. It is plain that we already have reservoirs near highways but I submit that several wrongs do not make a right and the fact that we have not had serious consequences to date does not mean that future generations are not going to show the effect of having interstate highways or other roads built right through reservoirs or over areas of reservoirs. If we allow the road to go as presently planned we are going to really pawn off a very beautiful functional and valuable emerald in my estimation which is the MDC land in West Hartford. There is much more

August 2, 1971

85

SENATOR JACKSON:

how fast
at stake than the/quality of our drinking water starts slipping away, as it surely will by decisions such as this, from the noise of the unwanted automobile. There is the agony of residential areas in Bloomfield and Windsor. There is the denuding and painting of one more strip of green light, but most telling to me as a legislator is people's opinion going unheeded. Two years ago at a Public Hearing the people spoke out very loud and forceably against the present plan and I call the present plan which is the same one at which we held the Public Hearing, they spoke on more than 8000 signatures from West Hartford which lead up to the hearing, they have spoken in hundred of published letters to the editor, they speak to me in telephone calls; even Governor Meskill in his election campaign heard these pleas and promised not to allow the highway to be built in the vicinity of the reservoir. Still the Department of Transportation grinds unswervingly on. Why? The time is gone when it could lay claim that it had the mandate of this General Assembly. The vote passing Representative Clark's and my bill at the regular session to restrict the location of the highway through that. They no longer have this mandate, I prefer not to believe that the Highway Lobby is responsible for this misguided plan, this frantic attempt to survive, nor are the department planners guilty of any conspiracy to frustrate the peoples desires. To me it looks simply like a matter of inertia. Inertia but well meaning misguided legality. What we have is a four stack interchange at Interstate I -84 which is presently built in existence and rather considering alternatives to it's intended purpose the planner proceed with a design which is engineerly more satisfying. However, the handwriting on the engineers drawing board is

August 2, 1971

86

SENATOR JACKSON:

not the same as the handwriting on the wall and I submit that a time when a road such as 1-291 could be planned and could be offered as a viable transportation alternative as passed . We in the General Assembly, recognize this fact by passing Senate Bill 1041. However, the Governor and the Department of Transportation have failed and been unwilling to recognize that we have now turned a page in our history as far as highways are concerned.

I ask the members of the Circle today to reaffirm our faith and responsibility, now only to our children but to our children's children, because once you send a contractor in and start tearing up this very delightful and pleasing, woodland and reservoir area, it is going to be too late. I would ask you all to review your consciences and if you feel if I do that we do have dedication, we have to dedicate ourselves to insuring that if the environment is not denuded, if we don't face up to the fact that unless we turn over to our next generation water that we can drink and air that we can breathe, I admit that nothing else is going to matter very much. So I would urge you very earnestly to give this your deepest consideration and give, or force the Department of Transportation to reevaluate it's thinking and come up with an alternative design that fits in with our present thinking.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? A Roll Call is ordered in the Senat.e

THE CLERK:

Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate Roll Call has been ordered in the Senat.e

Roll Call on Public Act 866. Sub. S.B. 1041. An Act Concerning Interstate Route 291 in West Hartford.

District 1	Senators	Fauliso	Absent
2		Smith	Yea
3		Burke	Yea
4		Odegard	Nay
5		Jackson	Yea
6		Pac	Yea
7		Alfano	Yea
8		Rome	Nay
9		Eddy	Nay
10		Ciarlone	Yea
11		Lieberman	Yea
12		Hammer	Nay
13		Zajac	Nay
14		Prete	Yea
15		Cuttillo	Absent
16		Sullivan	Yea
17		Buckley	Yea
18		Crafts	Yea
19		Murphy	Yea
20		Cashman	Nay
21		Gunther	Nay
22		Macauley	Nay
23		Caldwell	Yea
24		Petroni	Yea
25		Dowd	Absent
26		Rimer	Nay
27		Strada	Yea
28		Rudolf	Nay
29		Dupont	Yea
30		Power	Nay
31		Dinielli	Yea
32		Ives	Nay
33		Mondani	Yea
34		DiNardis	Nay
35		Houley	Yea
36		Finney	Nay

THE CHAIR:

The following is the Yea and Nay Vote

Whole Number Voting	33
Necessary for Passage	24
Those voting Yea	19
Those voting Nay	14
Those absent and not voting	3

The motion to repass is defeated and the Governor's Veto is upheld.