

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 638	PA 203	1977
House - 2873-2874		2
Senate - 1279-1280		2
Transportation - 499-402a, 424a, 437a, 441a-442a, 446a		9
LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY		13p.

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2015

H-188

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 7
2539-2978

Friday, May 6, 1977 109.

Page 16 of the Calendar, Calendar 882, Substitute for
S.B. 638, File 498, an Act concerning the Federal-Aid Urban System.
Favorable report of the Committee on Transportation.

efr
TAPE
#17

RICHARD D. TULISANO:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance and passage in concurrence.
Will you remark, sir?

RICHARD D. TULISANO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation would amend Section 13a-98f of the General Statutes. It authorizes the Department of Transportation to reimburse public utilities up to 50% of costs of relocating any underground or above line utility lines or poles, which may have to be relocated because of either relocation, expansion, or improvement of a highway system which is in the so-called urban systems program. At the present time, any time in a regular...and I use that word to mean non-Federally funded...a regular State highway system there is such a relocation, the same formula applies as I have described in this particular legislation, and this would just create an equality between relocation on any State road. I move acceptance and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

WALTER J. HENDERSON:

Friday, May 6, 1977 110.

Mr. Speaker, may I excuse myself from the debate and vote on this bill due to a possible conflict of interest.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, sir. The Journal will so note. Will you remark further on the bill? If not, will the Members please be seated, and the staff come to the well. The machine will be opened. Excuse me. I don't think the Chair cleared the machine from the prior vote. Would you please...the Chair will clear the machine. The Chair will clear the machine. Would you please wait until the machine's been reopened. Thank you. Now the machine is open. The machine is still open. Have all the Members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? Have all the Members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be closed, and the Clerk will take a tally.

JOHN J. ZAJAC, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, may I be registered in the affirmative.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please note. The Clerk please announce the tally.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting	140
Necessary for passage	71
Those voting Yea.	140
Those voting Nay.	0
Those absent and not voting	11

The bill is passed.

S-122

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 3
855-1312

1279

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

74

jgt

THE CHAIR:

We have several matters we passed temporarily and they'll be very brief, I'm sure. We'll get into The Order Of The Day.

THE CLERK:

Clerk passed temporarily Calendar, on page 3, Calendar 362, File 279, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations, Substitute for Senate Bill 876, An Act Concerning Occupational Disease Testing for Certain Employees. Waiting Senator Murphy's return, we'll continue to page 5 of the Calendar, Calendar 425 was PT'd. It's now going to be PR'd. Continuing on page 5, second item from the bottom, Calendar 445, File 264, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations. We'll pass that one over for the moment. Will somebody try to get Senator Murphy?

THE CHAIR:

Somebody please get Senator Murphy in here for the two PT's?

THE CLERK:

Continuing on page 8 of the Calendar, Calendar 485, File 498, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation. Substitute for Senate Bill 638. An Act Concerning the Federal Aid Urban System.

SENATOR OWENS:

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

THE CHAIR:

You have remarks, Senator?

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

75

jgt

SENATOR OWENS:

Yes. Very briefly, this bill deals with the relocation and reimbursement clause formed by the utilities in the state as well as municipalities. The bill gives the municipality and the Commissioner the right to order a utility to move its facilities and gives the cost assessment functions already under the statutes to be applicable to work done on federal aid extension highways, urban systems and state highways and on any other public highways. It's a bill that resolves any difficulties between the municipalities and in fact the utilities in the event that removal is necessary. I move its adoption and if there's no objection, I ask that it be moved to the Consent Calendar. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, put it on Consent.

THE CLERK:

Continuing on page 10 of the Calendar, top item on the page Calendar 497, Files 203 and 516. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Elections. Substitute for House Bill 8159. An Act Concerning Expenditures Permitted by Individuals, Stock Corporations, Business Organizations and Other Organizations. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A").

THE CHAIR:

Senator O'Leary.

THE CLERK:

We adopted Senate "A".

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION
PART 2
374-714

1977

MS. MANNARINO (Continued): I only mention this, to point up that DOT's lack of aggressiveness with regard to Public Transit.

Just to sum up the activity of DOT in the past few years has been basically a holding action, an attempt to maintain existing service and to make some marginal bus service improvements. To give them their due, they have been somewhat successful at it.

However, stabilization of what we have is not enough. The gasoline shortages and a continuation of extremely high smog levels facing us, we simply have to move more aggressively, faster and more imaginatively to expand our public transportation system. DOT as currently constituted, we believe is incapable of doing it. We think a strong CPTA is needed to be an advocate for public transit, enthusiastically and wholeheartedly working to establish a clean, convenient and efficient transportation for the state that we need so desperately.

And, I would also like to, very briefly, mention a few other Bills that we support. We support SB 213, CONSIDERING EXPERIMENTAL PASSENGER ROUTE, SB 214 CONCERNING THE PRESERVATION OF RAILROAD RIGHTS OF WAY, SB 5477 CONCERNING THE STAMFORD RAILROAD STATION, HB 6080 WHICH WOULD REQUIRE A STUDY TO BE DONE OF RAILROAD COMMUTER PARKING FACILITIES, and particularly HB 7004 WHICH IS AN ACT THAT WOULD FORCE DOT TO IMPLEMENT RAIL SERVICE on some the lines I mentioned earlier. In addition, to those, we support SB 1477 CONCERNING TAXATION OF RAILROAD COMPANIES. We think Connecticut should be proud that it is only, one of two states that has tax exemption for Railroad Companies, since the state should do as much as it can to encourage railroad companies to survive, we really need to do much more, than subsidizing the truck companies for a long time by building a beautiful highway system for them. Surely, we can do something very simple, like exempt them from taxation in the state. Thank you. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Is there any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE WALL: I'm Representative Wall of the 95th. I just want to say I agree, in most part, with your very observations and would you be kind enough to provide those statements in written form to us.

MS. MANNARINO: Yes, I have copies for the Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: We would appreciate for those people standing in the rear, if anybody has any lengthy discussions, will they please go outside, it is very difficult for the Committee Members who just came into the room to hear the people who are testifying.. Thank you.

CHARLES MOKRISKI: My name is Charles Mokriski, I'm an attorney from Hartford, I'm representing The Connecticut Water Works Association, in support of Senate Bill 638 AN ACT CONCERNING

MR. MOKRISKI (Continued): THE FEDERAL-AID SUBURBAN SYSTEM.

This is the position in which Northeast Utilities concurs as well.

that

This Bill is to ensure where highway projects are undertaken with the Federal Financing Assistance of the Federal-Aid Urban system, where such highway improvements necessitate the removal or relocation of utility facilities such as conduits, wires, mains, pipes, that the utility companies making such relocations and adjustments will be entitled to equitable reimbursement for expenses associated with them. Just as they are under Section 13a-126 for other highway projects.

The problem arose, due to enactment in 1975, of Public Act 75-45. Currently in the General Statutes 13a-126 provides general reimbursement, for utility companies where they are required to move their mains, their pipes or wires for a highway project and there are Federal Highway Statutes that provide for reimbursement to the State of the amounts paid to the utility companies.

What happened in 1975 and inconsistent provision with was adopted, which the Attorney General's Office has now opined occurs on an exception from the general reimbursement of 13a-126. I think that the exception was unintended, I've reviewed the legislative history of 75-385 and nowhere reveals any intent to carve out such an exception and what we proposes with 638, is to insure reimbursement is available. I think important that utility companies are reimbursed by the State for necessary removals and relocations, to make it possible to bring the extra Federal dollars into the State, rather than have the full cost of those reimbursements paid by Connecticut rate payers.

Under Title 23 of the U. S. Code, Section 123, the Federal Government, will reimbursement the State for any payments made for such relocations up to the percentage of Federal participation in the project, which in the Federal-Aid System is 70% . I think that we can all agree that it is preferable to bring these Federal Dollars into the State, rather than have the entire burden paid ultimately by the consumers of Connecticut utility services.

I marked up a copy of 638 because I think there are a couple of minor changes that should be made, in the way it's worded to insure the most beneficial form of reimbursement.

I'll leave this copy which I have marked substituted in part 638 with the Committee Chairman. If my changes insure that it is the State, not the municipalities, which are responsible for reimbursement, and I think this is important because the Federal reimbursement provision, entitled 23, Section 123 of the U. S. Code, makes it clear that the reimbursement goes a State, it's not clear that it would go to a political subdivision. An Alternative way of accomplishing the same purpose would be, with an Amendment to the general reimbursement provision Section 13a - 126, and if the Committee decides that, that would be the best way to go in restoring a lot of what it was, we have drafted language, to provide language to that end, but I think our preferred way of proceeding would be through substitute for Senate Bill 638. I might note that this Committee, being one of the

MR. MOKRISKI (Continued): more efficient at the General Assembly and having gotten a number of Bills on the Calendar already, has already made one slight change to Section 13a-98F of the General Statutes. Like the Bill on the Calendar, Senate Bill 344, 5011 which makes the change which is no problem to us, in fact we have incorporated that change in our Bill 638 here. I will be happy to answer any questions that the Committee might have.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Are there any questions? George Uihlein?

GEORGE UIHLEIN: My name is George Uihlein, and I'm Vice President of operations at the Southern Connecticut Gas Company, which is a Natural Gas Distribution Company, along the southern part of Connecticut. We service twenty-two (22) Towns, principally in the New Haven, Bridgeport Area.

I'm speaking in favor of Senate Bill 638 and agree wholeheartedly with everything that the previous speaker has said. We have in our franchise area, over sixteen hundred miles of main and over a hundred thousand services and also in our franchise area, we have approximately four hundred miles of State Highways, that fall under the Federal-Aid Urban System. Naturally, when we are ordered by the Department of Transportation, to relocate our facilities there's an awful high expense on us and ultimately on our rate payers. As the gentlemen, before me spoke that this was, seems to have come about inadvertently because in the past many years we were always reimbursed our proportionate share from the State, which ultimately came down from Federal Funds, and through some change, very recently from this date on, we will have to bear the cost solely by the gas company, this will put a disproportionately heavy cost on a relatively small number of utility customers for this work which benefits the general public.

I won't go into the examples, but we are doing a job currently on Route 135, on North Benson Road, in Fairfield, which is costing the utility customers \$120,000.00 to accommodate the highway improvement system on that road, and fortunately on that one, we have a signed agreement with the State and will be reimbursed approximately \$60,000.00, but if we were not, as in all future work, going to be reimbursed this additional burden will fall on our rate payers and it's something that the utility cannot control and it comes at a time when our rate payers are already paying a very high rate for rising energy costs.

In addition the readjustment expense for each utility company is a relatively small part, when you consider the total overall cost of the highway project, but if it has to be borne solely by the utility rate payers, then it become an inordinately high cost to them.

I support this proposed 638, as was said before, because it does provide a fair and equitable reimbursement for utility for readjustments within the Federal-Aid Urban system and for that reason, I do hope that this Committee, will see fit to favor Bill 638. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Al Magnoli? Excuse me, are there any questions? Thank you.

MR. MAGNOLI: Mr. Sweeney, Members of the Transportation Committee I'm Al Magnoli, I live in Newington, I'm also Co-Chairman of the I-291 WHY ASSOCIATION. I would like to talk on Resolution #3, introduced by Senator Mortensen.

I think for the most part this Resolution smells to high heaven, aside from being inappropriate. It is an attempt by it's author to conjure legislative support against I-291. When he was Mayor of Newington, he could not gather any great outcry. It makes a exaggerated assumption, that the people of Connecticut want I-291, completed. We should make a similiar assumption, that the people of I-291 do not want, the people of Connecticut do not want I-291 built. This assumption can be based on a petition submitted to Governor Meskill, signed by 5,000 individuals requesting a moratorium on the construction of I-291. We have received over three hundred (300) individual cashdonations for it's payment of attorney's fees. Hundreds of individuals attended fund raising dances, hundreds of individuals donated merchandise towards fund raising tag sales. Organizations, such as, The Connecticut Lung, The Sierra Club, The Newington Environmental Task Force, PCAG, Counsil of Environmental Quality, The Connecticut Air Conservation Committee, The Connecticut Transportation CoAlition, to name a few have supported out efforts.

This resolution is inappropriate, in that it is aksing the Committee and Legislature, to take sides and make a decision on I-291, circumventing due process of law, before all the evidence is in, that is the third Environmental Impact Statement, which is in it's final stages of completion. From the beginning we have encouraged, fought for and aided, the development of a complete and unbiased Impact Statement. We strongly feel that such be the case, I-291 will not be built. That there is an alternative to the building of this super highway, from I-91 in Rocky Hill to I-84 in Farmington. Newington is slated for the most part, to have ten lanes through it's Town.

Since, the injunction, succeeding events have vindicated our action and have added more fuel to the fire, strongly supporting our contention, that this regional highway will design and a duplicate road, which from I-91,parallels I-972, through New Britain, to I -84 in Plainville. It doesn't make sense, to spend approximately One hundred Million Dollars, at today's inflated prices, to build I-291, when we have Routes 972 which is under construction for the most part, which will also serve many of the functions, that I-291 serves.

It doesn't make sense, at a time when fuel shortage, seems to be the pattern of the future, automobile exhausts are already pushing regional air pollution beyonds the limits of Federal Standards and the roll of Mass Transportation and a Balanced Transport system is gaining acceptance, by Federal Agencies, Towns, Cities and the Public and, in general, this Administration

MR. CAVALLARO: improve the State, addressing its obligations with respect to the local share of requirements in the Northeast Corridor improvement program. We have an improvement program.

You have three (3) Bills before you related to the Federal Aid Urban system #639, #638 and #6732. We are totally opposed, the City of New Haven to 639, we have great reservations about 638 and we feel that 6732 seems to be the least, or the most acceptable of the three (3) Bills. I would just point out that, all three (3) Acts essentially approve of changing the amount of allocation for the first twenty-three (23) miles of the system. Now, this would seem to be a bill that would favor smaller communities. The City of New Haven has about 250 miles of maintained streets and twenty-three miles is less than one (1%) percent of that amount. Yet, if you were a very small community might be, would conceivably be much higher percentage. We could question why smaller communities should be given greater aid. It is our businesses and our residents that are being lost to the communities, outlying smaller communities that have lower tax rates, because of their..... local resources.

Oh, that commentary is with respect to Bill 6732, 638 and 639 relate to the utility elements of urban system projects. And, yet I repeat that we are totally opposed to 639, which would provide that a municipality get paid for the costs of utility relocation associated with that project. And, Bill 638 provides that the State and City share that utility cost, and on reading this Bill, we feel that it is not clear how that is determined and the extent of the exposure of the municipality to the, some limits on that exposure, with respect to paying for the utility relocation, we could be talking as far as a municipality is concerned, a catastrophic assessment for that utility relocation.

The last Bill that I would ask to make your permission to remark on is Bill 215 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REESTABLISHMENT OF AN AUTONOMOUS CONNECTICUT PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY. I think, that if the Legislature is concerned with the quality of transportation services of the State of Connecticut. That, if it is concerned with the amount of facilities we have in transportation, if it is concerned with its performance of the transportation systems that we have and the agencies associated with it. That the Legislature should direct those, should address those concerns in a different manner than this Bill. This Bill, I think, goes much to far, I think that the worse thing that we could have happen in the State of Connecticut, is to begin to divide up the transportation, and the basic transportation components into autonomous areas and autonomously operated areas and I think it will not serve the purposes that you are seeking. I think that the portions of this Act, as I read it, as related to transit districts, virtually, wipe out transit districts and you will recall that it was the Meskill Administration, that insisted that transit district be formed, as a condition to solving the bus crisis that was here in the State in 1973. A divisive and a partial issue that nobody felt comfortable with and that nobody has felt very happy the, completely happy with the solution. We have one bus firm remaining in this State. When we fought we lost, the second major bus firm in the State at that time, the CR&L Lines. If you recall that time, the State had, almost total evacuation of commuter rail

MR. BENTLEY (Continued): provided sufficient additional clearance for the highway bridge about twenty-three (23) feet over the subject road structure in order to accommodate future changes in elevation by the City.

Service has been discontinued on this line, but it has not been formally approved for abandonment by the I. C. C. and the tracks are still in place. The State has included this trackage in the rail bank program for future transportation purposes. Removal of the bridge therefore, would not be in the best interest of the State.

Bills 638 and 639 deal with the payment of the cost of Utility Relocations in Connection with Urban System Projects.

Urban System Projects are funded 70% by the Federal Government and 30% by the State if they deal with a State road and 15% by the State and 15% by the town if they deal with a town road.

A general procedure on Utility relocations is that under any program, if the work is on a State road, the cost is shared equally between the State and the Utility Company. If it is on a Town Road the cost is carried 100% by the Utility Company. Because of the wording of the Urban System's Legislation, it's been interpreted that the Utility Company should pay 100% of the cost of relocating on a Town road. We don't believe that was the original intent and the Department does not oppose changing the wording of the applicable legislation to require that the State share the cost of Utility relocation on State Roads.

However, these two Bills are not worded that way, if these bills were enacted as they read, they would require the State and/or the Towns to pick up 100% of the cost in both cases.

So we would respectfully ask that the Committee, examine the wording of both bills, I believe our position is basically the same as that of the Utility Companies on this legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Thank you. Any questions? Marvin B. Morganbessor

MARVIN B. MORGANBESSOR: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Marvin B. Morganbessor, Executive Vice President of The Connecticut Construction Industries Association, and I speak here today in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 3.

There are countless reasons favoring the construction of I 291. The factors of economics, the fact that all the polls taken showed the people want it, savings of time and energy, decrease in accidents, congestion, pollution and generally getting traffic off local streets. But, these factors are not really even necessary for the consideration of this resolution today. The most significant point of this resolution is that it is calling for the completion of Environmental Impact Statement on I 291, so that a decision can be made. In the present

MR. HUNTINGTON (Continued): My name is William Huntington, I am a resident of Uncasville, Connecticut and I'm speaking as the retired Chief Engineer of the Connecticut Department of Transportation, and as representative for the Bituminous Concrete Industry in Connecticut.

I am in favor of the intent of Bill 6036, although the language of the Bill as written, does not adequately provide the direction for the intended purpose.

The idea of this Bill, was to provide for partial distribution of some Town Aid Funding in the Spring of the year, say April 1st, prior to the beginning of the next Fiscal Year commencing July 1st.

There are numerous reasons for this proposal and two of them are of prime importance. First, the town roads often need much post-winter pavement maintenance after the frost left the ground. Perhaps, needless to say, this past winter has produced man cracked, heaved, and pot-holed pavements. Some early funding would allow a town to more economically make permanent type repairs in April, when the blacktop plants begin producing, than to make expedient temporary repairs and then in July and August to provide some more permanent correction along the same stretch of road.

Second the blacktop plants usually operate far under capacity during April, May and perhaps June. From July right up to cold weather in the Fall, the plants are often operating at or near capacity and often cannot meet the most desirable schedule of the Towns, the State and private users.

A more stable work force would result from a leveling of the demand. After July 1st, traffic densities increase and more inconvenience to the public results from mid-summer paving.

To carry out the objectives outlined herein it is recommended, although there are other ways of accomplishing this, that a revolving fund of two million dollars be established.

Attached to these comments is a proposed revision to Section 13a-175e of the General Statutes that we believe will provide the necessary controls and funding provisions for suitable legislative action. Any questions?

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Are there any questions? Thank you. I can't get the first name, the last name is Anderson.

EARL ANDERSON: Yes, it's Earl Anderson. I'm Assistant Vice President United Illuminating, we make and sell electricity in the Southern part of the State. Greater New Haven, Greater Bridgeport.

I speak here today on behalf of 638, Bill 638. Now, because there has already been previous testimony by other representatives of the Utility Industry, and because you were good enough here about a month ago, to allow me to come here and explain this to the Committee at a

MR. ANDERSON (Continued): Committee Meeting, I will not belabor the point any more in the interest of your time.

I did want to appear here however, to illustrate our continued interest in this. I would like to comment and offer compromise in this respect, that the two speakers, the representative of Mayor Logue, was concerned about the Bill due to what he thought was a pass on to the Municipality and subsequently Mr. Bentley, representing DOT, saying, although they do not oppose our position to return to the described position, prior to the recent ruling last year.

You are concerned that the wording presently seemed to leave the door open to being able to pass on some of this costs to the Utilities to the Municipalities. I was a part of the meeting that determined the position we would take and I would like to say clearly, that there is not intent to do this, as we are most willing to work out the necessary wording to make this, to clarify this. As a matter of fact, Mr. Mokriski, who represented the Northeast Utilities and the Water Works Association, is an attorney and in the hall, after his testimony he talked with representatives of DOT and expressed his willingness to sit down with them and help work out the wording, with your permission of course.

So, that I think basically in summing up our position we are simply asking for return to the previous situation, whereby 50% of the cost of relocation of utility facilities, in connection with Urban System Roads, State Roads, if you prefer, would be passed on to the State, which in turn collects a portion of this from the Federal Government. The end result naturally, is a benefit to the Citizens of Connecticut, who are both rate payers, on one hand and of course, taxpayers on the other, and with as much money as Connecticut has flowing out to the Federal Government, I think if there is a chance to recover some of that, I think we propose taking this route.

Again, I thank you for allowing me to come here again and speak on this and giving it consideration, we do ask you to favorably report out. Be glad to answer any questions which you may have. Thank you again.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Any questions? Robert McKernan.

ROBERT MCKERNAN: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I'm Robert McKernan, Executive Representative from Consolidated Rail Corporation, and I'd like to speak on several Bills. The first being Senator Schneller's Bill 181. I suggest a slight amendment or addition to it.

There are within the State of Connecticut, possibly 361 bridges over railroads. In the Metropolitan Region about 67, AmTrack another 125 and the Northeast Region of ConnRail, P&W, and others, including the State, another 173.

MR. MCKERNAN (Continued): this to the attention of the AmTrack people. The Town of Madison is concerned, because they have one other bridge they want to fix and they have been given again a high premium quote on that, but I don't believe that this, aside from its constitutional aspects, whether the State should enter into this, that one problem which is peculiar to this Town alone should be legislated.

I suggest therefore, that in the interest of a uniform legislation, that this be backed, I will say that we continue to alert Amrack to the problem and hope that they can resolve this with the Town of Madison. It does not effect ConnRail in that sense, but it certainly will effect ConnRail and other railroads in the State if you impose different standards than we are now working under in our insurance program.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Any questions. Thank you. George W. Bennett, Jr.

GEORGE W. BENNETT, JR. My name is George Bennett, I represent Southern New England Telephone Company and I would like to speak very briefly to the subject matter of Senate Bill 638.

We do not have a prepared statement at this time, we've not previously communicated with the Committee on this subject, but we do in essence support the position, which would restore the statutes to the position or the provisions that were included prior to orders of last year.

In other words, we expect to submit a, shortly will submit a statement which we expect will be in concert with the Department of Transportation position. We think that the one based on the analysis of '68, may go a little bit further than any of us originally intended. So this is merely a statement of support of the subject matter. We will submit a position paper for this. What value it may be to you, but the important thing is that we expect to be in support of the Departments's position on the subject. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Any questions? Thank you. Bill Huebner.

BILL HUEBNER: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Transportation Committee. My name is Bill Huebner, I represent the Heavy Constructions, known as LITE, Laborers, Ironworkers, Teamsters and Operating Engineers.

Every Local of LITE, is in favor of Joint Senate Resolution 3.

We are the labor force that not only builds highways, but nuclear plants, bridges, tunnels, and we do offshore drilling for oil. You may have heard some opposition for this Resolution. The opposition comes from a small handful of no growth advocates, who are expert propagandists, especially, when they say, on interstate highway only 10% goes for wages. When, in fact, under the Federal Highway Administration, 24.09 % of each dollar is for labor.

Interstate 291 is needed. We are the builders who want to build it. Tonight there will be another hearing and for the first time you're going to see how this long hand full of no growth advocates that stopped this highway, are in a very small minority, because