

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 71	PA 261	SCAN	1972
House:	2577-2588		12
Senate:	1770-1772		3
Transportation:	5-7		3
Banks:	(20-26), 27		8
Related Interim Hearing on Banks:			10
	2/2/1972 3-12		Total: 36

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2016

H-129

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1972

VOL. 15
PART 7
2495-2872

House items taken up-----

REP. AJELLO: (118th)

It's a good idea, sir. I move that we suspend the rules for immediate transmittal to the Senate of those matters which we have adopted but are still in the hands of the Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the House items taken up since the last motion on this subject are transmitted with their amendments to the State Senate.

REP. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, directing the Clerk's attention to Cal. No. 568 at the middle of page 5.

THE CLERK:

With one star, Cal. No. 568, sub. for S.B. No. 71, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS OF TRANSIT DISTRICTS FORMED UNDER CHAPTER 103a. (As amendend by Senate Amendment Schedule A).

Favorable report of the Committee on Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Chair recognizes the gentleman from the 82nd, Rep. DeBaise, Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Transportation.

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Thank you sir. Mr. Speaker, I move for suspension for immediate consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended. The gentleman from the 82nd.

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

84

hw

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

Clerk call Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A" LCO memo 1868: Section 1, line 9, strike out "mass" and insert "land."

In line 28, strike out "air rights",

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

Will you remark.

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment Schedule "A" merely inserts the word "land" in lieu thereof of the word "mass" simply because this particular bill relates to land transportation, and in line 28 it deletes the word "air rights" for the same reason.

I move passage of the amendment, adoption of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Senate "A". If not, the question is on adoption of Senate "A".

All those in favor indicate by saying "aye." Opposed, Senate "A" is adopted and ruled technical.

Would you remark further on the bill as amended.

Rep. DeBaise.

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

85

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker, we're standing today on the threshold of a new type of mass transportation districts in the State of Connecticut. This is a transit district bill that will provide transit districts with the powers they need in order to be prepared to play a role if necessary to preserve the present operation of busses by the Connecticut Company and to begin to tackle the problem of mass transportation in congested areas.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also consolidates provisions in Bill No. 71 concerning entering and withdrawing from transit districts. This is permissive legislation by municipal bodies. It also incorporates a provisional bill 5269 which would enable the Department of Transportation to assist transit district from the proceeds of the public service tax fund. Many of the provisions of this bill are intended to clarify the existing legislation governing transit district in Chapter 103a. The bill does not require any state appropriation and the major provision of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

It declares that mass transit systems are a public necessity. It also expands the power of transit districts to cover all forms of land transportation systems for the mass movement of people including monorail, minibus, trolley, people movers, etc., but not highways. Mr. Speaker, it does this so that transit districts can begin long range planning for integrated mass transit system best suited for their

hw

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

86

areas. It is permissive legislation, Mr. Speaker, in that it allows municipalities to join and withdraw from transit districts by votes of their respective bodies. It provides (inaudible) formation of transit districts. Mr. Speaker, it will also have within the transit districts the discretion to assume PUC supervision of private transit operations.

Mr. Speaker, it's a good bill and I urge its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Hanzalek from the 40th.

REP. HANZALEK: (40th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a question through you to Rep.---(MR. SPEAKER: Please state your question for the gentleman) The Senate Amendment "A" removed air rights from the bill, if I remember correctly. I wonder how it would then be possible to institute the monorail or other elevated type mass transit facilities that you might want to think about.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman care to respond.

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Mr. Speaker, through you sir, I would believe that monorails would have to be built upon the land that portion thereof the foundation of which would carry the monorails.

REP. HANZALEK: (40th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, suppose you were taking this

hw

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

87

hw

form of mass transportation into a large city, you had to go over highways, you had to go over perhaps city playgrounds or something or other, wouldn't you then need to have air rights in order to be able to do this?

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman care to respond to the question? The question be restated for the benefit of the gentleman. Please restate the question.

REP. HANZALEK: (40th)

I'll try. I wondered if, for example, the mass transit system that you were thinking of had to go into a large metropolitan city. It's quite possible that the route would take it over highways that also enter the city, might take it over city parks or playgrounds, other pieces of city property or private property where you might need air rights rather than the rights to buy the property.

REP. DeBAISE: (82nd)

Through you sir, it is possible that municipalities may have to use the power of eminent domain, but again this is permissive legislation only in power to the legislative bodies through this act. So it may be possible that the legislative body would have to consider that plan if indeed it did infringe on playgrounds, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: - Rep. Pearson from the 128th.

REP. PEARSON: (128th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I commend the efforts of the committee and I realize that mass transportation is a

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

88

hw

laudable need and effort but my objection to this particular bill is the fact that the bill does take away the rights of the referendum. Now this particular measure that we do have before us would allow the municipal officers of a community to make a direct agreement with regards to the establishment of transit districts in their area. Now I feel that this would be over any objections of citizens because they would be denied the right of a referendum by this particular bill. We had similar bills before us in the last session which I also spoke in opposition to and although I realize the transportation problem is heeded, the basic rights as far as I'm concerned of the citizens of the state of Connecticut are rights of referendum and I feel very strongly that this does take away that right and moves away at it at the erosion of our particular right.

I think the Supreme Court had recently made a ruling regarding housing and the Court made the quote that provisions for referendums demonstrate devotion to democracy. Now I feel that in Connecticut today in adopting this type of a measure no matter how you look at this, it's actually taking away the rights of citizens, that your referendum is a foundation on which I feel very strongly that our democracy has been constructed, and I think that we should continue to build on that foundation and not to destroy it in the manner of removing a referendum. I object to the removing of the referendum. I've tried to support that type of measure on any item that we've had up here on basic principle of my particular

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

89

hw

feeling. I don't feel that I've been elected to--up here to bypass people or to override their vote and I must say that I very strongly oppose that particular section of the bill which removes the votes of the citizens by taking away the referendum as now recorded in the statutes and by letting the legislative body or the municipal officers make these decisions, so I oppose the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: - Rep. Nicholas Lenge from the 13th in West Hartford.

REP. LENGE: (13th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this bill and particularly the last portion made reference to with respect to a proposal that the legislative bodies of the municipalities make the decision of approval or rejection to be included in a mass transit district.

This is no threat to the democratic process. The fact remains that the legislative body is elected. It is charged with the responsibility of evaluation. They are charged with the responsibility of educating and bringing the pros and the cons of the proposition to the people of the particular municipality as well as the greater municipality and obviously in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, where our democracy works by representation, this is a valid approach to a very complicated matter, the transportation structure and system of the State of Connecticut in its urban centers. This is a tremendous constructed improvement and one that should be supported wholeheartedly, and in no way is it a threat to the democratic

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

90

hw

process.

MR. SPEAKER: Rep. Nevas from the 144th in Westport.

REP. NEVAS: (144th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. My community about two or three years ago by referendum elected to constitute itself as a transit district and we are now in the process we've just had completed a study of a minibus transportation system for the community. There will be a public hearing at one of our junior high schools this Thursday night and the whole concept of minibus transportation for the elderly, for teenagers, for youngsters whose mothers are constantly enslaved to that bane of all mother's existence, the car pool, are all enthusiastically supporting this proposal, and I think in quick reading of this---of the file, this legislation will serve to strengthen the whole concept of communities constituting themselves as transit districts and helping themselves.

I enthusiastically support the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. Rep. Oliver from the 104th.

REP. OLIVER: (104th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I would point out to the gentle lady from the 128th that although one referendum provision was taken out another referendum provision was put back, perhaps the most important of all. I'm sure she's read pages -----(MR. SPEAKER: Rep. Tacinelli doesn't have that problem) (REP. TACINELLI: It's allright, Mr. Speaker,

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

91

hw

it's an ill microphone) On pages 12 and 13 the gentle lady will note that before bonds can be issued by the transit districts that need it, indeed right there the heart of the matter for without the bonds, without the money you can't do anything. There can be a referendum on petition by a represent number of electors. So I would suggest to the lady and to those who are worried about the lack of a referendum that a formation of a district, the real heart of it, the guts of it, the money, does a referendum a possibility.

I rise to support it but I also want to lament that the bill doesn't really go far enough. It allows municipalities to join together to begin to attack the problem of mass transportation, land mass transportation. But it doesn't really have a firm state commitment to support it in terms of dollars. I see no real reference here to a firm commitment of the public service fund by the Transportation Commissioner. Remember in the hearings the Appropriations Committee several weeks back we learned how little, how little indeed of the funds available in the public service fund and compared to the funds in the highway fund are made available for land transportation. I think it's a sad day for with this bill on the books we're taking a first step and perhaps one day in the Transportation Department they will begin to come around and give the funding the transportation districts -- the transit districts here are going to need because I think it's a misapprehension if we believe by passing this bill and

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

92

permitting impoverished municipalities to join together that they're going then be by virtue of their joining together be rich enough to cure the deep rooted problem of urban mass transit. They're not going to be, it's going to take state action, it's going to take vigorous state action, it's going to take firm commitment from the public service fund, I don't see it in the bill but this is at least a first step.

MR. SPEAKER: - Rep. Ritter from the 6th.

REP. RITTER: (6th)

Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support this bill. I'm aware of the hundreds of hours that have gone into this bill, been worked on by people from all over the state and I think particular credit has to go to the Transportation Committee of the General Assembly. It is a bi-partisan effort spear-headed by Republicans and Democrats alike to try to meet the crisis of mass transit in our state. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that there (inaudible) of funds to come from the public service fund and contrary to the position that some people have taken, the Commissioner of Transportation believes at this time that he does not have the power to use the public service fund for these purposes. This does give him the power to use the public service tax fund for the purpose of mass transportation other than railroads. So I urge that we demonstrate our support for this by racking up a unanimous vote and again, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I think this tends to give another example of why the annual session of the

hw

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

93

hw

Legislature is a helpful and desirable one because this may be essential legislation come September and if we didn't have it on the books come September we could be in great trouble.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended. Rep. Gennaro Frate from the 150th.

REP. FRATE: (150th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. There is a safeguard in there as the Representative from New Haven said and if the people aren't happy with what their legislative branch says, that they can petition and call for a referendum.

MR. SPEAKER:

Rep. Pearson for the second time, I believe.

REP. PEARSON: (128th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. In defense of myself, the Representative from New Haven did point out (inaudible) referendum but I would like to comment that on line 538 it says "if petition requesting a referendum" so the people would have to go out and petition if they felt they wanted to, so it doesn't definitely provide for a referendum and it would be an easy thing enough for the Legislature to then also remove that section as they have removed the section of the referendum in order to establish a transit district as we also have another bill on our Calendar today which would remove the right for referendum on bonds so I am a little concerned if we're doing it on one item we could then do it on this. So I do not feel that the voters do have the

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

94

hw

right or the protection of that referendum.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage as amended.

All those in favor indicate by saying "aye." Opposed.

Bill as amended is passed.

Gentleman from the 118th.

REP. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, we may now back up one on page 5, Cal. No. 567.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having passed the transportation bill, we'll back up one.

REP. AJELLO: (118th)

And if you pass (inaudible) you get \$200.

MR. SPEAKER:

Oops, strike that from the record.

THE CLERK:

With one star, Cal. No. 567, S.B. No. 250. AN ACT
CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING COMMISSION
LOANS TO INDUSTRY. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule
"A").

Favorable report of the Committee on Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: - Rep. Spain from the 166th.

REP. SPAIN: (166th)

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the suspension of the rules?

Hearing none, so ordered.

S-87

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1972

VOL. 13
PART 4
1457-181

April 13, 1972

129.

third item from the bottom of the page, Calendar No. 344, File No. 511, Favorable Report, Joint Standing Committee on Transportation Substitute Senate Bill 71, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS OF TRANSIT DISTRICTS FORMED UNDER CHAPTER 103A.

(The President in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, the Clerk has an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Alfano. Do you move acceptance of the Favorable Report and passage of the Bill?

SENATOR MONDANI:

I move adoption of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Do you wish to have the Clerk read or waive the reading of the Amendment?

SENATOR MONDANI:

I'd waive the reading of the Amendment. I can explain.

THE CHAIR:

Will you move the Amendment? Remark on the Amendment.

SENATOR MONDANI:

I move the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. President, the Amendment just changes in Section 1 of the Bill, the word mass transportation to land transportation and it deletes in the same section, air rights. And the Amendment

April 13, 1972

130.

is necessary to preclude any fears that this might wind up as a jetport legislation Bill. I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark further? Hearing none, all those in favor of adoption of the Amendment signify by saying aye. Opposed, nay. The Amendment is adopted and ruled technical. You may remark if you will, on the Bill as amended.

SENATOR MONDANI:

Mr. President, this measure is to me, one of the most important ones coming from the Transportation Committee which sets up the powers in the Transit Districts formed under Chapter 103A. The Banks and Regulated Activities Committee had heard testimony. We had testimony. It improves the whole procedure. It sets up a declaration of mass transportation systems are a public necessity. It expands the powers of transit districts to cover all forms of land transportation for the mass movement of people - monorails, minibuses, trolleys, etc. Municipalities may join or withdraw from transit districts by vote of their legislative bodies to permit speedy formation of transportation districts. The Directors would be appointed by the Chief Executive Officers of these municipalities with approval of the legislative bodies. I'm sure Mr. President, that in our desire to alleviate problems in large municipality and in the outlying suburbs, transit districts will be the vehicle for success. Many people worked long and hard hours on this measure. I endorse it heartily and I would like to yield to Senator DeNardis from the 34th.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeNardis.

April 13, 1972

131.

SENATOR DE NARDIS:

Mr. President and Members of the Circle, it is indeed a pleasure to be able to offer some comments on hopefully, the passage of this Bill. As Senator Mondani has indicated, it is an extremely important measure. It will provide for the speedy formation of Transit Districts and hopefully the full-fledged operation in our Metropolitan areas of Transit Districts that can begin the very important work of planning and the development of mass transit in our State. I think what this Bill will do ultimately, is reverse the long trend of putting all of our transportation eggs into one basket to aid the private motor cars to the virtual exclusion of other forms of transit. I believe that this Bill will aid considerably in reversing that trend and promoting mass transit and I commend Senator Mondani for his work in putting this package together and I urge its warm and speedy endorsement.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the Bill as amended. Will you remark further? Hearing none, all these in favor of passage of the Bill as amended, signify by saying aye. Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 348, File No. 364, Favorable Report, Joint Standing Committee on Finance on House Bill 5304, AN ACT CONCERNING AUTHORIZED BORROWING OF FUNDS BY MUNICIPALITIES IN CONNECTION WITH A DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

THE CHAIR:

Passed temporarily unless there is a Senator who wishes to report on behalf of the Chairman. Finance.

THE CLERK:

Next Calendar No. is Calendar No. 349, File No. 343, Favorable Report,

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

TRANSPORTATION

1972

legislature passed, and rightly so, Public Act 503 which was our relocation act. In 1971 in order to have legislation which paralleled the Federal Law on relocation assistance, the legislature passed Public Act 838. In doing so, inadvertently left out this particular clause which would provide authority for payment of certain legal and penalty fees to the property owner. The Department of Transportation does favor this, in that this would be restored to 838.

Chairman O'Dea: Are there any questions? Anyone else in favor of the bill? Anyone opposed to the bill? The hearing is closed on HB 5241. We now have HB 5307, an act concerning state aid for town roads. Anyone speak in favor?

William Legeyt: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, William Legeyt, the first selectman, town of Barkhamstead. Also President of the Lynchville county mayors and selectmen association, representing 26 towns in Lynchville county. I would like to speak in favor of this HB 5307. We think it's due, we've been after this extra amount of money for a number of years and I see this bill today, this is the first time I've had a chance to look at it, I certainly am in favor due to the increase of cost of materials that we have in the last few years. I think it's time that we had the extra money. We also realize that we are on an austererity program but we hope that the Committee and also the legislature finds extra revenues in gas tax. We feel that even a percentage of an increase in this bill is very beneficial to the small towns and cities. Thank you.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, Mr. Legeyt. Anyone else in favor?

Jack Thompson: Chairman O'Dea, members of the Committee, my name is Jack Thompson. I'm the Mayor of Manchester and I'm speaking in behalf of the Connecticut Conference of Mayors. HB 5307 would correct an oversight in the previous session, 15 million dollars is appropriated but the enabling statute contained the old appropriation of 12 million. The effect of this bill would release an additional 3 million dollars this fiscal year for state aid, town roads. These funds, in my community, for example, provide the major thrust for our paving program and as the previous speaker mentioned, town and city roads have increased maintenance costs have also risen and we believe this help would be extremely important to all our cities and towns. I hope you'll give it your favorable consideration.

Chairman O'Dea: Are there any questions? Anyone else in favor of the bill? Any opposition to the bill? The hearing is closed on HB 5307. The next bill we have is SB 71, an act concerning the formation of transit districts. Anyone to speak in favor of this bill?

William E. Keish, Jr.: My name is William E. Keish, Jr. Director of Communications for the Department of Transportation, speaking on

SB 71, an act concerning formation of transit districts. Under existing legislation, establishment of transit districts requires favorable action at the next election through a referendum. This means that in some instances delays up to two years are encountered in the formation of transit districts. Enactment of SB 71 will expedite such formation by providing for the establishment of such districts by vote of the legislative body of municipalities. The Department supports this legislation because the expeditious formation of transit districts is required to insure the preservation and improvement of local transportation service. It is my understanding that it was vetoed.

Senator Mondani: Does the Department know whether it would be vetoed were it now-----?

Mr. Keish: It is my understanding now that the Governor would be in favor of this type of approach to the development of mass transit districts.

Representative DeBaise: Is there any conflict here with the PUC regulations?

Mr. Keish: That I'm unaware of and I couldn't answer the question.

Chairman O'Dea: Are there any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Keish. Next in favor.

Jack Thompson: My name is Jack Thompson, Mayor of Manchester. Again I'm speaking in behalf of the Connecticut Conference of Mayors, in support of SB 71 which would eliminate the requirement of a referendum for a town to participate in mass transit districts. On behalf of the Conference, we believe the problems of transportation will not in any way be resolved within town lines. Regional problems face us, we must be able to work in co-operation with neighboring towns and cities. I might point out that at other regional functions we are participating in such as the Capitol Regional Council of Government and Capitol Regional Planning Agency do not require a referendum and we believe the local legislative body should be free to make this type of decision. We speak in support of it and ask your favorable consideration.

Chairman O'Dea: Any questions?

Mr. Thompson: May I answer Senator Mondani's question about the problem of the veto. We've also been informed it will be looked upon differently this session if it's passed.

Chairman O'Dea: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. Anyone else to speak in favor of this bill?

Daniel Benson: I am Daniel Benson, on the staff of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce and I'm here to speak on SB 71. The Chamber expressed its general support for the bill which calls for towns to be allowed to join or withdraw from transit dis-

tricts by action of their legislative bodies. The present procedure for joining a transit district is cumbersome and in our opinion inhibits the development of transit districts representation from all the towns within a region. The present procedure calls for a special referendum of the towns electorate and typically these referendums are at times other than on regular days, regular election days. We would point out, however, that bill number 5397, introduced by Rep. George Ritter, also enjoys our complete support. This bill provides for towns to join a transit district by action of its legislative body but it also suggests that for a town to withdraw from a district it allows, it requires a petition of 20 % of the towns electors and calling for a subsequent referendum. In the last session of the legislature as someone had observed the Governor vetoed a bill similar to SB 71 on the grounds that action to join or withdraw a transit district solely by the action of the towns legislative body precludes proper exercise of the power of the towns electorate, therefore we are in accord with the intent of the bill which would encourage the towns to join transit districts. We also feel that perhaps Mr. Ritter's bill number 5297 might answer some of the Governor's objections. However, as Mr. Keish and Mr. Thompson have observed the Governor has changed his position on bills of this type and he would not veto SB 71. We would consider this very advantageous.

Chairman O'Dea: Has that Ritter bill gone before another committee? It's gone before Banks and Regulated Activities. Are there any other questions? Thank you. Anyone else to speak on SB 71? Any opposition to this bill? Are there any legislators who want to speak on any bill? We've heard all the bills listed for today. The hearing is over.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**BANKS &
REGULATED
ACTIVITIES
ELECTIONS**

LIQUOR CONTROL

**PUBLIC
PERSONNEL
& MILITARY
AFFAIRS**

RULES

1971-1972

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

CHAIRMAN BUCKLEY: Seeing no one else coming forward on 196 the Hearing will be closed on that Bill, and we will move to the next Bill which is AN ACT - No, this is the Participation Bill and we've already given this Bill a Joint Favorables -

(COMMENT BY SECRETARY)

CHAIRMAN BUCKLEY: Okay, it's not listed, we'll proceed to the next one - AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER TO TRANSIT DISTRICTS OF ONE PER CENT OF THE GAS AND SPECIAL FUEL TAX ON SALES WITHIN THE TRANSIT DISTRICT.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BLAKE: Senator Buckley, I'd just like to make a very brief statement on this next package of Bills. I wonder if it's the right thing to be having Hearings on them today, because - and I wonder because the fact that it's conceivable to me that the whole subject may be hurt. These Bills are now in the possession of the Committee on Transportation, they will be heard there, they will be acted on by this Committee and proceed from there to the Committee on Finance. Now the - several people on the Transportation Committee have spoken to me and have objected to the Banks Committee having Hearings on these Bills, and I question outloud the wisdom or the purpose of such a Hearing. However, I have no objection other than I feel that the Chairman of the Transportation Committee may take a kind of a dim view about holding a additional Hearing on these particular Bills. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BUCKLEY: Thank you. This subject did come up at the Executive Session of I think late last week, and the majority of people here at the time were in agreement, Doctor, that these Bills did properly belong in another Committee. Since they had been listed in the Bulletin and since the people who were going to - or might want to testify on them had been given notice that they would be given a Hearing here, our conclusion ran along the same lines as yours, that we would conduct the Hearing, take the transcript and send it to Transportation and Finance with the Bills on a Change of Reference. So, just to accommodate those people who are here in the hope that Transportation will not feel it necessary to hold another Hearing of their own, in fact I don't see how they could if they haven't scheduled one by this time early next week with the deadline for Favorable Reports, they might not be going to. Maybe this will be a service to them. In any event we hope it will be, so those people who would like to speak in favor of the first Bill announced - AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSFER TO TRANSIT DISTRICTS OF ONE PER CENT OF THE GAS AND SPECIAL FUEL TAX - which is Bill Number 5268, obviously a numbering from the last Session, but that's the number on it. Anyone who would choose to address us concerning that may now come forward.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

ROBERT ZWIRNER: I'm Robert Zwirner, Vice Chairman of the Greater Hartford Transit District. I'm a resident of Windsor. The first Bill, and if I may the three following Bills that we're considering are treated by us as necessary to our possible need to act in crisis. The problems of transportation are obvious to us in our towns. Member towns of the District have directed us, who are the members of the District, the Directors of the District, to make sure that there will be no loss of transportation or continuity of operation of whatever form of bus systems we have. And it is to this purpose that these Bills have been presented to you. If there are any further questions about the changes and the passed legislation we have other persons here who would be pleased to answer the technical questions, which I am not. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BUCKLEY: Any questions? Sir.

EDMUND SEE: My name is Edmund See, I'm an Attorney at Day, Berry and Howard. I worked with the Transit District to draft this legislation at the request of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, which feels for the same reasons expressed by Mr. Zwirner, that there is a problem of crisis in the Greater Hartford Area, at least, and that the powers of transit districts under the existing statutes should be expanded in order to meet this crisis. The Bills have been before the Committee, they have been explained in the past, and I would like to summarize a few of the highlights.

The first one, of the Financing Bills, provides that one per cent of the Gas Tax collected within a transit district would go to a Mass Transit Board that already existed, in other words none of the money would come out of the - from the Gas Tax, unless there were a Transit District in operation in that area. It is contemplated that this money would at least provide start up funds for a district to be able to prepare its plans and hire employees to begin operations of the District.

The second two Bills authorize the Transportation Commissioner one to use Highway Funds for mass transportation and transit district purposes, and two to use monies presently in the Public Service Tax Fund for transit district purposes. The purpose here is not to require the Commissioner to do so, but to specify that he has the power to use the monies for these purposes. Under the Public Service Tax Fund legislation before you, it would raise the amount of money in that fund which would be available for mass transportation purposes, and at the request of the City of Hartford, which the Transit District endorses. We would

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

like to make one change in that particular Bill to prevent extra funds available for mass transportation to be returned to the General Fund at the end of each year. We have the feeling that this Fund was established for the purposes of mass transportation, and that the money should be used for that purpose.

On the last Bill which expands the powers of the Transit Districts themselves, I don't believe there is at present a copy before the Committee. It is, fine. To highlight some of the changes, first there is a declaration that mass transportation in transit districts are public necessity, which reaffirms the need for mass transportation, second it expands --

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE RITTER: Would you hold it for a mement, please. Could you tell us the number that's been assigned to this by the Committee? This is a raised Committee Bill, but there is no number on it. This is the last Bill, which was a separate one, it's not in the package.

COMMENT BY SECRETARY: (That will be 5279.) (SB. 71)

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: 5279, just for the purpose of your record, 5279 okay.

MR. SEE: 5279, that is correct. In 5279, the second point that I would highlight is that it expands the forms of mass transportation which the Transit District can operate and supervise to other forms of land transportation. Under the - right now the Transit District's concerned about making plans for a - immediate plans for eventual forms of mass transportation which go beyond a bus service, which is its only power under the existing statute. Third highlighted change is that a transit district can be formed only by the vote of a legislative body of a municipality without referendum, but that a municipality can withdraw by referendum on petition of twenty per cent of the electors. This preserves the powers of the electors to move the municipality to withdraw, but it also makes it possible for the municipality to join a district very quickly.

Another change would clarify that the Transit District has the power to assume PUC regulation of operations within the district. It authorizes that the Transit District subsidize private systems, it extends the power of eminent domain over real estate and public service franchises, it clarifies its present power of assessment as a power to tax based on population and potential loss of service within the district as under the existing statute.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

Finally, it redefines the Bond Provisions, makes it possible to issue both General Obligation Bonds and Revenue Bonds, after a vote of the Board of Directors after Public Hearing, and provides for a referendum, district-wide referendum, on General Obligation Bonds which exceed \$250,000 on petition of either 10 per cent of the electors of one municipality or 5 per cent of the electors throughout the district.

Those, I believe are the highlights of the Bill. If there are any specific questions, I would be willing to respond to them.

CHAIRMAN BLAKE: Any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE CRETELLA: Representative Cretella, 99th District. I think, that in commenting on the Bill in the group of Bills relating to Funding, it would appear to me that the very first paragraph of your 5279 where you start out by saying that mass transportation is recognized to be a necessity, I think that that raps up the whole philosophy, if I might say so. You're treating these more or less as a way of life. You start out with a preamble that says, that mass transportation is a necessity, such as welfare and education and so forth. When you start out with that philosophy, it then follows that you are not taking into consideration whether mass transportation is going to be a money-maker, whether it's going to support itself. In effect, you are saying that the Highway Transportation Fund or the Gas Tax Fund in effect becomes a subsidy for mass transportation. If you don't recognize that fact, then all of the Bills of Necessity might fall, no matter how high their purpose, no matter how commendable their purpose is, because I don't believe that you maintain, or I've never heard it maintained that any mass transit district is going to end up being a money-maker or supporting itself. Is that correct?

MR. SEE: That would be a correct interpretation. It is a feeling of the Transit District that both mass transportation and highway transportation should be interrelated, and that when you're creating a system of transportation, you should take into consideration the needs of all modes of transportation. And that the funds that are allocated for both highway and transportation use should basically be from the same funds, so that your funding and your planning can come from the same source. And I would agree with you that mass transportation would require subsidies and these Bills basically make it possible for those subsidies to come from the State.

REPRESENTATIVE CRETELLA: Just one more comment then, and that is that since no one has yet found a way to spend the same dollar in two separate places, that if you are going to use the funds

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

to subsidize mass transit, then in effect that is going to mean that there will be less dollars available for highway construction, and that you now run into a question of priorities, as to where the dollar is spent first.

MR. SEE: Let me clarify what we've done in the Funding Bills. First of all, the one Bill which would take one per cent of the Gas Fund would actually take a very small amount of money, because there are very few transit districts presently in operation in the State. I do not believe that the amount of money that will be taken out of the Highway Fund under that Bill would significantly affect present plans for highway construction in the State.

The other two Bills basically authorize the Commissioner of Transportation, rather than actually require, that he use the Highway Funds for mass transit purposes. Last, the Public Service Tax Fund was established for mass transportation purposes, and this basically provides that the --

INTERRUPTION BY HOUSE ROLL CALL

the Highway Fund Bill basically authorizes the Commissioner, but does not require him to use the funds for mass transit purposes. Public Service Tax Fund Bill authorizes him to use the funds available there for transit district purposes, raises the amount that is - that can come from that fund to be used for transit district purposes, and we would amend it to provide that the funds could not be returned to the General Fund, that they had to be used for mass transportation purposes. Which means that the Commissioner of Transportation can use them for any of the purposes of mass transportation as expressed under existing legislation for his Department, not just for transit districts.

REPRESENTATIVE CRETELLA: I just want to conclude for the record, Doctor, that I was one of the members of both Banking and Transportation Committee who went on record as objecting to these Hearings being held before this Committee. Primarily because I feel that they'd belong in Transportation, but more so because I feel that the entire picture has to be looked at, in so far as highway construction, and mass transit subsidizing, which I'm - I'm willing to admit that mass transit subsidizing is going to probably become a necessity in this State, if it is not already a necessity. But I think we've got to look very hard at where those funds are going to come from, and I am - at this stage of the game not thoroughly convinced that the Highway Fund as such should be the prime target for that subsidizing. And when you say, it's only one per cent of the Gasoline Tax under this Bill, my answer is simply, that's this year. Thank you.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

CHAIRMAN BLAKE: Mr. Clynes, do you have a question?

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES CLYNES: Yes. Representative Clynes. I believe in your testimony you spoke of a municipality joining as a transit district by means of their own legislative body, but could only withdraw, could have a referendum to withdraw. And I'm wondering why, what your thinking is there. Why not a referendum prior to the legislative body acting in that municipality?

MR. SEE: The purpose - under present statutes you have to have a vote of the legislative body and a referendum. The purpose of the proposed change was to make it possible for a municipality to join a transit district quickly, rather than having to wait for Public Referendum and go to the expense of a Public Referendum. It was thought that the legislators of the municipality would represent the wishes and feelings of the electors, and that if the electors didn't want to join that the legislators wouldn't go along. On the other hand, it was felt that if there was a situation where the local legislators were not representing the wishes of their constituents that there should be a provision for withdrawal by initiative, by referendum. And this was why the withdrawal provision was based on referendum by petition, rather than vote of the legislative body to withdraw.

CHAIRMAN BLAKE: Any other questions? Thank you Sir. Commissioner.

SAMUEL KANELL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Samuel Kanell, Deputy Transportation Commissioner, Bureau of Rail and Motor Carrier Services. I appear in opposition to all of these Bills, and if you approve, I'm prepared to discuss all of them jointly if you would so approve. 5268 speaks of a one per cent diversion of monies from the Highway Fund, and the former speaker said that this would be pertained only to taxes collected within the transit district. I don't read the Bill that way. As I read the Bill, one per cent of the entire Highway Fund, which would be 1.4 million dollars would be available upon request of any transit district. And I see no controls in this Bill, no means to say what the transit district could do with this money. It's simply a total flat grant of 1.4 million dollars without any provision for controls. We oppose this Bill. We don't think it's a proper way to go about it. And I have more to say about that, but let me take that in context with the other Bills. 5269 is the Bill with respect to providing funds for transit districts from the Public Service Tax Fund. It would mend the existing legislation to provide for grants, loans or subsidies to transit districts, and it would increase the portion of monies available in the Public Service Tax Fund from the existing 20 per cent to 30 per cent to support Public Transportation. We're talking about five million dollars, that's

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

what we're talking about. And let me tell you the history of this, as I think I have been exposed to this for some years. When the Public Service Tax Fund was established, it was not a new Tax, it wasn't a new source of revenue, it was simply taking monies that were then in the General Fund, and are still in the General Fund, and earmarking a portion of these monies for public transportation purposes. It was no new source, it was simply a way of allocating specific funds that were available, starting 1965, they were then available, and make them - earmarking them to be used for public transportation purposes, with the approval of the State Bond Commission. And I was involved in those discussions, I was involved in writing the Bill. It was never intended at that time that that full amount of money would be used or would be required to support, at that time the emergency involving the railroad, we had that emergency crisis before us. It was intended to be a top amount, never expecting the total amount to have to be used, and we've never used the total amount. The indication always has been, or the intent always has been, to return to General Fund that portion of monies that were not required in that particular year to provide - to support rail services. And approximately two years later, the Bill was amended to include support for bus service. So this concept of returning monies into the General Fund is not new. This is the way it was always written, with that intent. Now, to take another five million dollars out of the General Fund and earmark it for public transportation is not necessary. There is ample funding under existing legislation to support all necessary programs.

And to go a step further, I can't speak the number of the Bill this time, but there is a - what I believe this might be termed an Administration Bill which would do two things in respect to the Gasoline Fund or the Tax Fund, excuse me - Highway Fund. It would redesignate that as a Transportation Fund and provide that with the discretion of the Transportation Commissioner and the approval of the State Bond Commission, as I believe it will be written, ten per cent of that Fund may be used for other purposes. This would be aeronautics, public transportation, and any other purposes. So why do... legislation I see no need for Bill Number 5269,

Bill Number 5270 again would tap the - what is now the Highway Fund, which will be redesignated I understand as Transportation Fund, for the same purpose to support public transportation. Again I find no need for that, in view of the fact there is now ample funding. And under proposed legislation there will be provisions for utilization of ten per cent of the Highway Fund for other transportation

26
JR

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

MARCH 8, 1972

purposes.

Now, Bill Number 5279 I received what I think is a draft of it. It's designated here as Senate Bill Number 71. I hope it's the same Bill, it's a twenty page Bill. Is it the same one? I just have some comments on the Bill. The purport of the Bill, I understand the purport order of the Bill simply takes existing Chapter 103a, amends it in part and puts more language in. It does provide for eminent domain for acquisition of private companies by transit districts. I can't say it's a bad power to have, but I would point out that generally you pay more for these properties when you exercise eminent domain than you do by negotiation. We have been acquiring railroad property, especially Penn rights of way, and I think we're buying them for a very reasonable price. To date the only I have made have not exceeded five or six thousand dollars per mile of right of way. Eminent domain basis might be ten times that. So, I question whether eminent domain might be in the best interest of the States, in view of the nature of this situation where here we have private bus companies who publicly say they're anxious to get out of business, anxious to leave, so what would be a fair price for properties under circumstances would not be a fair price under eminent domain proceedings. You might end up paying far more.

Section 4 of the Bill speaks of levying tax on municipalities. Well, this is a serious thing. I hope the consequence willthis type of Bill is enacted where transit districts, municipalities of the towns, can in turn levy tax on municipalities. Section 10 provides for a grant of up to two-thirds by the State Department of Transportation for Administrative costs of transit districts. I don't think this should be a proper for to pay administrative costs.

This concludes what my comments on these pending Bills. Of course, I'd be happy to answer any questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BLAKE: Mr. Ritter.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE RITTER: George Ritter of the Sixth Assembly District. May I turn to 5268, you indicated that you opposed this because, as you said, in fact the tax is the entire one per cent.

MR. KANELL: That's how I read the Bill.

REPRESENTATIVE RITTER: May I invite you to look at lines twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty-six, and I'll read them quickly. Maybe you can read them to yourself.

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

Rep. Blake: We'll take up the subject of a NEW BILL TO BE INTRODUCED CONCERNING MASS TRANSIT DISTRICTS. Anyone wish to speak in favor? Commissioner Kanell.

NEW BILL TO BE INTRODUCED CONCERNING MASS TRANSIT DISTRICTS.

Samuel Kanell: I am Samuel Kanell, Deputy Transportation Commissioner of the Bureau of Rail and Motor Carrier Services. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, at a session of this Committee held two months ago on the problem of busses, we made available to you a proposed draft of a bill that would expedite the formation of transit districts. We asked your favorable consideration of this unnumbered bill. It takes existing Sub-Section C of Section 7-273B of the General Statutes and simply adds these words after the words "after next election or" and these words are inserted: "at the option of the legislative body of each municipality at a special referendum as provided in Section 7-9C of the 1969 Supplement to the General Statutes". Those words would be inserted. And the purpose of this bill is simply this; under the present statute a transit district may be formed only at the next general referendum, this may take up to two years in some instances, this bill would expedite the formation of a transit district by authorizing the Legislative Body to call for special referendum, and this means we could have a transit district established in a matter of weeks rather than a matter of a year or two. We feel that with the more effective participation of local cities and towns through the vehicle transit districts we can move much more rapidly to meet our bus crisis and to provide for the State's willful partnership that is required to both preserve and improve local bus service.

Rep. Blake: Any questions of the Commissioner? Any member of the Committee have any questions? Thank you Commissioner.

Commissioner Kanell: Thank you.

Nicholas Dentamaro: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Nicholas Dentamaro. I am the Treasurer of The Greater Hartford Transit District and the Director from the town of East Hartford. I am here today to propose amendments to Chapter 103a on Transit Districts. I have eleven proposed amendments here that I would like to go over step by step with you that we are later in turn want to propose these as bills into the General Assembly. The first one is:

No. 1. Purpose of Transit Districts - Mass transportation is a public necessity, and transit districts are necessary to satisfy this need.

No. 2. Formation of District - Permit municipalities to join a transit district by vote of their legislative body, but without the necessity of a referendum.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

- No. 3. Service - Extend powers of a transit district to encompass other forms of mass transportation in addition to bus service.
- No. 4. Powers - Clarify power of a transit district to acquire, operate or subsidize an existing bus or transit company, such as The Connecticut Company, both within the district and in neighboring municipalities.
- No. 5. Condemnation - Extend to transit districts the power of eminent domain to take over public transportation companies, which refuse to sell out to a transit district, even though the PUC has determined that such a company is suitable for acquisition by a transit district.
- No. 6. Bonds - Authorize transit districts to issue revenue bonds as well as general obligation bonds. Bonds will be issued after public hearing. A referendum may be held on any proposed issue of general obligation bonds which exceeds \$250,000, if either ten per cent of the voters in any municipality in the district, or five per cent of all the voters in the district, petition for the referendum.
- No. 7. Administration Expenses - The state will defray two-thirds of a transit district's administrative expenses, and the constituent municipalities will defray one-third.
- No. 8. Public Service Tax Fund - Thirty per cent of the Public Service Tax Fund will be made available for mass transportation expenses, including expenses of transit districts.
- No. 9. State Highway Trust Fund - Monies in the Highway Trust Fund will be allocated for mass transportation expenses, including the expenses of transit districts.
- No. 10. Gas Tax - A portion of the gas tax collected in each transit district will be transferred to the transit district.
- No. 11. State Subsidy - Clarify power of the state to make grants to transit districts to help defray the expense of acquiring, developing, operating or subsidizing mass transit systems.

Thank you Gentlemen.

Rep. Blake: Just a minute please, would you care to speak in a little detail on Sections Two and Five as to what your thinking is on those and the reasons for them, some of those things. Section Two or Proposal Two and Proposal Five.

Mr. Dentamaro: Proposal Two on the Formation of the District, this is a - in other words- this is a bill that was presented to the last General Assembly, which has passed both the General Assembly and the Senate and was veoted by the Governor. Now this is more or less almost the same as Mr. Kanell's Bill, except that we will have the municipalities give the power to the municipalities to join a district without a referendum vote, but which would take considerable time, and if they wanted to join they can join by one council vote, and that would put them in the district as soon as possible.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

Rep. Owen Clark: In some towns....the legislative body is the town meeting.

Mr. Dentamaro: Well then in those towns thats fine, but in the towns that have it be referendum vote this would more or less make it so you can join without a referendum on a vote machine. Yes Sir?

Rep. Clark: Question. For my information, this statement here is submitted by The Greater Hartford Transit District. Do all of the towns involved 100 per cent subscribe to this, authorize these particular statements all and each of them?

Mr. Dentamaro: Yes Sir.

Rep. Clark: It was one hundred per cent vote of all of the members of The Greater Hartford Transit District?

Mr. Dentamaro: Of the Greater Hartford Transit District.

Rep. Clark: All of the towns' members?

Mr. Dentamaro: Yes Sir.

Rep. Roy Ervin: Question. The Governor vetoed that portion of the bill?

Mr. Dentamaro: Right.

Rep. Ervin: What was his reason that he gave for vetoing the bill?

Mr. Dentamaro: To tell you the truth, I can't answer that.

Rep. Ervin: What was the Public Issue.....?

Mr. Dentamaro: It wasn't a Public Act, because it was never passed.

Rep. Robert Bruno: Mr. Chairman, I'm Representative Bruno, on Item 7 - Administration Expenses have you any idea what the amount of dollars that is? Have you given any consideration of what the Administration Expenses as far as dollars and cents are concerned?

Mr. Dentamaro: Well, so far we have a proposed budget of close to \$40,000.00, Administrative Expenses. But, you must realize this will increase as we - you know - as we go along. When we start applying to the Federal Government for monies these expenses will increase.

Rep. Bruno: Will the Transit District pay anything into this fund, or will it all be subsidized by the state or towns?

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

Mr. Dentamaro: No, the state-we are- what we want to do is make this so the state will pay two-thirds, and the towns will pay one-third.

Rep. Bruno: What does the Transit District do? Do they pay anything into the fund?

Mr. Dentamaro: Yes. They are given voluntarily assessments to us, to the member towns, which I understand all the towns are participating, except the Town of Vernon. And, we hope to get the Town of Vernon to participate into this.

Rep. Bruno: They all pay certain amounts to your fund?

Mr. Dentamaro: They all - The City of Hartford is - The only one who hasn't approved it yet is Vernon and the City of Hartford, but the City of Hartford plans to take action tonight, this afternoon or tonight, on this and this should go through so that it'll be just the Town of Vernon, and we are getting in touch with the officials of Vernon.

Rep. Bruno: Just one more question. Just to get it clear in my mind, in other words if the transit districts, or the members of it, say pay in \$100.00 dollars and the Administrative Expenses run to \$200.00 dollars that's when the state pays two-thirds and the towns pay one-third. Is that the correct sum?

Mr. Dentamaro: Well, we will need money to apply to the Federal Government for, you know, for money for them, plus we will have to come up with some money when we do get it from the Federal Government. So, this would take care of probably the over-all Administration Expenses to apply to these agencies.

Rep. John D. McHugh: May I refer to Item No. 6, and ask you why did you use the word in the third sentence, "the referendum may be held", why didn't you use the word shall? In other words, if 10 per cent of the municipality and five per cent of the district vote for it, why aren't you required to have a referendum rather than have just an election "may"?

Mr. Dentamaro: Excuse me, it should be shall.

Rep. Blake: Could I ask you one question? I think as time goes on.. this particular proposal is going to generate a lot of questions in the minds of the people on this Committee. Am I correct in understanding, or is my understanding correct that George Ritter is prepared to answer the questions which may arise in an Executive Session on behalf of this bill?

Mr. Dentamaro: Yes.

Rep. Blake: If so, I think that between now and the time the Executive Session is held that many questions will arise, and if George is able to answer them I would suggest that you brief him as completely as possible before then.

Mr. Dentamaro: Thank you.

Rep. Harry Wenz: I would like to ask you a question.

Mr. Dentamaro: Yes, Sir.

Rep. Wenz: In Section 5 you are asking for the right of eminent domain over a public company; in Section 7 you're looking for Administration Expenses from the State of Connecticut; in Section 8 you want part of the Public Service Tax; in Section 9 you want a part of the Highway Trust Fund; in Section 10 you want a part of the Gas Tax Fund; in Section 11 you're talking about State Subsidies, the only thing I don't see here is asking for the gold on the Capitol Dome! How much is this suppose to cost us? How much is this going to cost the citizens of the State of Connecticut?

Rep. Blake: In all seriousness, I would suggest that Mr. Ritter be well briefed before we have the Committee Hearing on this.

Mr. Dentamaro: We intend to.

Rep. Wenz: May I have an answer to the question?

Mr. Dentamaro: Well, mass transportation to me, in my own knowledge, mass transportation is going to be a very expensive thing in the state, seeing that we have no mass transportation.

Rep. Wenz: I'm aware of that.

Mr. Dentamaro: So, I mean if the people want mass transportation they should be ready to pay for it.

Rep. Wenz: They should?

Mr. Dentamaro: Like they pay for every other luxury.

Rep. Wenz: Then you don't know what it's going to cost in X No. of dollars.

Mr. Dentamaro: No.

Rep. Owen Clark: I have one other question, I assume that question Dr. Blake said will hold, but under what Act, or what authority, or what conditions is within their scope or power now - these words "that even though the PUC has determined that such a Company is suitable for acquisition by a transit district" - that is the Public Law now, or do you intend to have bills before the Public Utilities that would give them this enabling power, or is it there now?

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

(Answer inaudible)

Rep. Blake: Are there any other questions? If not, thank you very much for your kindness in comming.

Mr. Dentamaro: Thank you gentlemen.

Rep. Blake: Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of this proposal?

Edward Lane-Reticker: Mr. Chairman, I'm Edward Lane-Reticker, Chairman of the Transportation Committee of The Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce. We are in full support of the principles of this bill for Amendments to the Transit District Legislation. Several years ago when it appeared that the New Haven Railroad might be disposing of The Connecticut Company, and The Connecticut Company might be dissolved, the Chamber worked with local officials in the Hartford Area on the Original Transit District Legislation. That Transit District Legislation was something of an emergency matter. As it turned out, it was not needed immediately because The Connecticut Company was not dissolved, and it was acquired by local private interests. In recent years The Connecticut Company, as everybody knows, has run into difficulties and has had to increase it's fares, and in somecases reduce schedules and services. We believe that there is a kind of an emergency in that as the situation grows more critical it could occur between now and the next time that the Legislature meets that there would be a definite occasion of which a transit district would have to assume responsibility for mass transportation in The Greater Hartford Area. Last summer's hearing before the Public Utilities Commission, which occured after a petition by the Mayor of West Hartford, and the Mayor of Hartford determined that "the Connecticut Company at the time was not suitable for acquisition by a transit district" - those being the words of the present Transit District Statute. But, that determination appears to have been made at least as much on the basis of the transit district's powers, as on the condition of The Connecticut Company. It was brought out at the hearing before the PUC that in various governmental powers the transit district, The Greater Hartford Transit District, was quite lacking; so that it was not at all clear that if the transit district were to assume responsibility for mass transportation it would have the necessary power to operate it successfully.

These proposals of The Greater Hartford Transit District, which are only in outline form and need to be flushed out, are aimed at providing the transit district with the necessary powers should the need arise. And the Greater Hartford Chamber supports them.

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

Senator Lewis Rome: Excuse me, could I interrupt? You've been involved in this for a long time as George with the transit districts. Are you prepared to collaborate with them on specific legislation to find a...if this Committee is going to consider it. And, this is merely a draft of some ideas, as he pointed out they're very far reaching. There will have to be some changes made, and I'm wondering if you're prepared to collaborate on some specific legislative changes?

Edward Lane-Reticker: Senator Rome, The Transit District and the Chamber have talked about that, and we're prepared to lend every bit of assistance to getting the bill.

Senator Rome: Due to the fact that an emergency existed, and as I understand it the Transportation Department also wants to fortify the transit districts. I understand that time is running out very shortly and short session. I would hopeforthwith.

Edward Lane-Reticker: Senator Rome, we're working on it right now, and the drafting is going on.

Rep. George Ritter: I think you might just briefly explain to the Committee for the Senator's concern how we met yesterday and reinforced our desire to move forward and that you made available to the Commission legal services at no cost to the Transit District, and that we are going to be moving forward together.

Senator Rome: All I'm trying to caution you Ed, is that I think it behooves you to do more than suggest proposed outlines for legislation at this time. I think it's that late.

Mr. Reticker: Within a few days we'll have a bill for you.

Rep. Blake: Anyone else wish to speak in behalf of this subject?

Eugene L. Belisle: My name is Eugene L. Belisle, I'm Development Director for the City of Hartford, and I'm representing here the City of Hartford. I must give you just a few words of background and identification. On November 16, which was the period at which the strike crisis broke relative to the bus company, The Connecticut Company, the City Manager designated a staff group of four people headed by his Executive Secretary, Mr. Edward Lehan, and consisting of John T. Walsh, Finance Director, Howard Nannen, Principal Planner, and the Planning Agency, and myself as a Inter-departmental Staff Group responsible to the City Manager to undertake all necessary studies, activities, to provide advice to the City Administration and the City Council, and subject to their approval and policy positions, to represent the interest of the City in this respect. At approximately that same time, a request had been received from the Chairman of the Transit District for some staff assistance in dealing with

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

comparable problems with information and advice, and this same staff group was designated by the City Manager to be available for the advice and information of the Transit District. That offer was formally accepted by resolution of the Transit District at that meeting, if I remember correctly on November 19th, and since that time I have attended all meetings of the Transit District, except one where there was an oversight failure to notify me of a reconvene session. And, I have also attended two meetings of the Transit District meeting as a committee-of-the-whole on Legislation, once a week ago Monday night, and once this last Monday night.

I want to emphasize, however, that what I say I have no authority to speak, of course, for the Transit District. I do speak for the City of Hartford, but because of some of the circumstances of this session today, I will make some statements which have not been reviewed and approved in detail either by the staff group from the city which I'm speaking for, nor by the City Government of Hartford, but in which I feel either fairly confident that the position that I will express as a personal position will be that essentially of the City Administration of the City Government of Hartford. Might I start by saying that the City Government of Hartford with respect to this problem is pursuing a general policy position that was set forth in a Council Resolution on November 11th of 1971, and I would like to read to you certain language from that Resolution because since that time the essential policy position has not only been reaffirmed, but all of the perspectives which led to the Statement of that Policy Position on November 11th, have in the judgement of the staff group, the City Administration, and the City Council alike been reinforced so that the position is being now restated with renewed emphasis and perspective. And, some of the points that were just made about the time urgency of this situation, and where we stand with respect to basic information on the problem we're dealing with here are behind our view of what represents Legislation that should be undertaken in this Legislative Session, as against Legislative proposals which in our view cannot be soundly thought through and worked out in this Legislative Session, and which should therefore become a matter of basic study between now and the regular session in 1973. By which time in fact - long before which time - we will have from our staff group reports beyond the initial background report which I have here, and which will be submitted for the information of your Commission. We will have additional reports that go into an analysis of various alternatives, which we feel need to be considered in coming to grips finally with the formulation at the State level of basically new policy, and structure, and financing to deal with the 1970's. Whereas, what we are dealing with, Gentlemen, now today is a somewhat jerry-built structure dating from consecutive Acts with different perspectives,

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

WEDNESDAY

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

Under different circumstances starting with The Transit District Act of 1961, The State Transportation Authority Act of 1965, The Amendment of the Public Service Tax Fund in 1967, The Establishment of a Department of Transportation in 1969 -

Senator Rome: Excuse me, could I interrupt you temporarily?

Mr. Belisle: Sure.

Senator Rome: I'd like to ask, if we were to invite you to participate with The Greater Hartford Chamber and with the Transit District, and I'm sure they'd accept that invite, would you collaborate with them on legislation immediately?

Mr. Belisle: Most certainly.

Senator Rome: And if in fact you have a Minority Report would you submit that?

Mr. Belisle: Yes.

Senator Rome: I think what could happen today is that we could have a lengthy discussion of the history of the Statutes, but I don't think they'd be as fruitful as specific recommendations on legislation.

Mr. Belisle: May I however, Mr. Chairman, therefore just cut quickly to a comment on this specific bill and also the proposed amendments to the Transit District, just quickly on these so that --

Senator Rome: As far as I'm concerned, I don't know Mr. Chairman whether you agree, but as far as I'm concerned there are no specific amendments.

Mr. Belisle: Okay.

Senator Rome: These are so general that they couldn't, Mr. Chairman am I correct, they could not be considered to be valid suggestions, they are less thanI think what we want to do is focus on your collective expertise in looking at a bill which would be substantial in the area of transportation. We have the background of the Report to the Governor on Transportation, by the Transportation Committee, and your own work and background, and I think that would be more helpful than anything else.

Rep. Blake: I think that Senator Rome has expressed the same intent which I was trying to get across there on several comments. Number one, that we have nothing to go on here, and until - unless - such time as we do have, we can't do a great deal about it here.

BANKS AND REGULATED ACTIVITIES

FEBRUARY 2, 1972

WEDNESDAY

Mr. Belisle: Gentlemen, in the meantime I would be glad to file with you these copies of the reports which contain, just if I may quickly identify, one of the things which in thewas done is to go down through the Transit District Act and all of the other basic legislation that I've made - mentioned - indicating even dates of Public Acts, that amended one or another of these pieces of Legislation. And, there is a Summary and Abstract with specific Section and Paragraph References that deal with the present legal structure which we feel would be helpful to everybody. This also projects in Section 2 - a statement - a report on the Tax Exemptions on Real and Personal Property of The Connecticut Company for the past eleven years, which is mandatory for the City to give under State Statute, and summarizes the total of tax exemptions by the City of Hartford. The Third Section reports on, and here there are unfortunately three different sets of figures because they came from three different state sources, and they don't quite match up probably due to accountancy reasons that we don't yet understand, the receipts and disposition of the Public Service Tax Fund since it's inception. And finally, a brief Summary Review of the general background of the Emergence of The Connecticut Company, The Transit District and what's been happening in this area. And, I'll be glad to supply additional copies, so that every member of the Commission can have one if he would like. I only have a limited number here.

Rep. Blake: Thank you, and just one more final statement. I would suggest for your information and for anyone else interested in this particular area of consideration, that you have someone here to work for your bills which will be brought before this Committee in Executive Session. And, I would suggest that in as much as Mr. Ritter is interested vitally in your proposition that you have him well briefed, because there are many, many questions which will arise.

Mr. Belisle: Right. And, I'd be glad, Senator Rome or Committee to work in any way that would be helpful. And I'm speaking for the Task Group of the City of Hartford, and not alone for myself.

Rep. Blake: Thank you.

Mr. Belisle: Thank you.

Rep. Blake: Anyone else wish to speak in favor of this subject? If not, is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition? If not, the subject matter is closed, and we'll go on to the last proposition today, which is AN ACT TO PERMIT SAVINGS BANKS TO INVEST IN PUBLIC SERVICES. Anyone wish to speak in favor of such a proposition?