

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 344	PA 342	Scan	1977
House - 4280-4295			16
Senate - 404-405			2
Transportation - 50-52, 99-100			5

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY 23P

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2015

H-191

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 10
3864-4326

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

66
teg

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on passage. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will the members please take their seats? Staff and guests please come to the well of the House, the machine will be opened. 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. The Clerk will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Total Number Voting	137
Necessary for Passage	69
Those voting Yea	134
Those voting Nay	3
Those absent and not voting	14

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. no. 175, S.B. No. 344, files 11 and 979, An Act Concerning the Federal Aid Urban System for Certain Highways, in Connecticut, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A, Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Serrani.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

67
teg

Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill and would you remark sir?

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment and if I could be able to summarize when called?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule A, would the Clerk please call?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule A, L.C.O. 6127, offered by Senator Owens of the 22nd district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any objection to the Gentleman from the 144th in summarizing Senate Amendment Schedule A? Please proceed sir.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, quite briefly, the amendment moves the passage date up from being effective on passage to July 1, 1977. I move for adoption sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule A. Would you remark further? If not, all those in favor of Senate Amendment Schedule A will indicate by saying aye. Those opposed?

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

68
teg

Senate Amendment Schedule A is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senate A is ruled technical by the Chair. Representative Serrani.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, the bill establishes an additional local option to pay the entire shared non-federal costs of urban aid, Federal Urban Aid system funding for local highways. It would allow a city or a town to pay the state's share of the 30 percent funding to be matched with 70 percent Federal Aid funding for local highways, if the locality and the Commissioner of Transportation deem that advisable. I move for adoption of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A? Would you remark further? Representative Osler.

MRS. OBLER (150th):

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question through you of the proponent of the bill please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MRS. OSLER (150th):

Assuming that the Department of Transportation would have a freeze on funds or have spent up to the maximum of their budget for the year, that a municipality would be asked to do that? A municipality would be asking to do that in order to get the job

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

69
teg

finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Serrani.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, through you sir, yes because of financial problems in the last few years, there have been projects in some localities which could have been completed and could have been paid for the municipality but there was no statutory language allowing them to pay for that percent. Presently the Federal Government pays 70 percent for the funding, the state pays 15 percent and the locality pays 15 percent. This would allow a locality to request from the Commissioner of Transportation the ability to pay the entire 30 percent to get the project moving off the boards.

MRS. OSLER (150th):

Another question, through you, Mr. Speaker, it does mention in the bill any thing about the fact that funds might not be available to the State Department of Transportation to do this and I'm just wondering if weever might come to a point where the Department might refuse the state's share just because they weren't so crazy about that particular stretch of highway or politic reason that the party in power and the state was not the same party that was in power in a town or any of a number of reasons that one could dream up. Is there any control that municipalities

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

70
teg

would have over this kind of abuse of the power of the Department of Transportation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative From the 144th.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, presently any local road projects that is acceptable for Federal funding is placed on a regional priority list and those projects must be handled one by one. And some projects which are not on the highest priority list, may be a high priority to that particular town and they may have the funding to complete that project, so they want to put their 30 percent in and be able to meet the Federal requirements for the 70 percent. And so for this reason a municipality would pay the 30 percent funding enabling them to receive the 70 percent funding and get that road project going into construction phases. So it's an important bill to the locality to municipalities. This is another option that they have.

MRS. OSLER (150th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative from the 17th district.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this bill. One of the towns that I represent, Bloomfield, has asked me to support this particular legislation. There is a road

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977 71
teg

in our town that is despairly needed and the town is interested and willing to put money into see that the road is built and we have not been able work it out to have it built with State funds but this would give us an opportunity to have a road completed which we feel is urgently needed in our community. And I'm sure there are other towns in the state that could benefit equally if this particular legislation is passed. Therefore I would request your support for this particular bill. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? Representative Mazza.

MR. MAZZA (115th):

Mr. Speaker, a question through you to the proponent please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed sir.

MR. MAZZA (115th):

Representative Serrani, in line 28 you're removing the word "shall" and replacing that with the word "may". I think the question that was addressed to you by Representative Osler, if the project is started and there are some state funding coming, there's no indication here whether the funds be available or not, the State can renege on such a project and may pay for their share. The project can be left uncompleted and this is the project that concerns me, may be you can clear that up.

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

72
teg
(rec.11)

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 144th.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, through you sir, the line 28 in the bill changing "shall" to "may" is a correction that is necessary so that the town can pay that share. It is not indicated at all, it's not placed in there to indicate at all to the fact that the State can renege on any kind of an agreement. Because we're talking about the municipality and the department making agreement here. So the municipality plays a major role in this. This is an option to the municipality and it's a good bill and I think it ought to pass.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? Representative Kipp.

MRS. KIPP (41st):

Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question through you please for clarification for Representative Serrani.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MRS. KIPP (41st):

Representative, I'm still just a touched confused over Representative Oslen's original question. Is there any particular lead time in or guarantee if the localities decide to go into an arrangement such as this sort so that there would be some sort of

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

73
teg

guarantee that the town having made the arrangement using the money and all good faith, would indeed not find itself out in left field at one given point?

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 144th.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, in making an application to the Federal Government the state has to be involved and so the State has to agree that the municipality is able to pay that 30 percent funding and this would be a commitment on the part of the state in writing on the application.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Kipp.

MRS. KIPP (41st):

Mr. Speaker, thank you, what I'm trying to get at is not so much whether towns will, it's the guarantee that the State will not back out. In other words, I don't want any town whether it's mine, yours, or anyone, I don't know whether I disagree with the concept. I'm just worried that we may go into this large commitment and I can think of maybe a couple of instances in my area that this might work out beautifully as a matter of fact. But whether we can pay the commitment or not is not my worry right now, it's whether the other parties involved, if it is an iron-clad guarantee?

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Serrani.

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

74
teg

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Through you sir, all I can say is that from the Department of Transportation, there is a commitment to all projects that they go into agreement with. I can't see where they would renege on any agreement that they would pursue with any town. I hope I understand your question correctly. I'm trying to answer it correctly.

MRS. KIPP (41st):

Alright, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Kevin Johnston.

MR. JOHNSTON (51st):

Mr. Speaker, a question through you to the proponent of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed sir.

MR. JOHNSTON (51st):

Mr. Serrani, I'm not totally aware of the process that we're talking about here but I have somewhat of a fear that if the state decides it wants to save some money in the future that it's going to not only renege but just not enter into the agreements with communities and more or less force them through this statute to pay for full 30 percent. Is that a legitimate fear?

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

75
teg

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 144th.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Through you sir, well if I can take this from ground zero it may help in terms of answering your question. Your town and my town may apply to the Department of Transportation for an application for a Federal Aid to a local road. My town may have 15 different road projects they would like to apply for and your town may have 10 road projects that they would like to apply for. The determination of which road projects are of priority are based upon a regional determination. My particular area being Fairfield County, the road projects would be a one to ninety bases for example. Priority would be one to ninety and only those projects which did have priorities would get a consideration in terms of an application for Federal funding. They're not going to chose all the projects which one or another town is going to apply for. Only chose those projects which are of priority. Now I don't see the reason for the bill is not because the State wants to save money. It's because in many cases they haven't had the money and certain road projects were so far down on the priority list but important to those particular localities, that the localities wanted to pay that 30 percent to get those road projects going rather than wait a couple of years to get the money and be able to pay for that particular portion of non-Federal share of funding for that particular road. So the bill is

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977 76
teg

not to save money, it's because the State has not had money in past few years. This creates another option to the locality to fund those particular road projects.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Johnston.

MR. JOHNSTON (51st):

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the intent of this bill but I still have some hesitation, even if a project is high on the priority list, if the State decides it may want to save money down the road that it may start slowing down on pushing for those priorities and I'm just kind of worried about what's going to happen. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 141st.

MR. VANNORSTRAND (141st):

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to the proponent. I've heard questions from both sides of the isle, Representative Serrani, and I think they come down to one thing. And I just think we ought to make that clear for the Assembly. Is it not a fact, although that not be the purpose for this legislation, that indeed a road, the State could take the position with this legislation that that road doesn't get built until you pay the whole 30 percent?

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 144th.

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

777
teg

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Mr. Speaker, through you sir, I don't believe that's the case.

MR. VANNORSTRAND (141st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't say that would happen. You're saying that's not possible to happen?

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Through you sir, the initiation comes from the town to pay the 30 percent, not from the State to tell the town that they have to pay the 30 percent. The initiation is in the part of the locality which is requesting from the Department of Transportation to pay for the 30 percent so your town and mine town would have to request the Commissioner if they wanted to pay for that 30 percent because of a low rating on the priority list. And it wouldn't be initiated from the Department to the town telling them that they would have to pay the 30 percent, the total of non-Federal share.

MR. VANNORSTRAND (141st):

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Kemler of the 18th district.

MR. KEMLER (18th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you, very briefly, I would just like to concur with the remarks of Representative Swomley. I too heard from my town and they requested very strongly that our delegation

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

78
teg

support this legislation because it would be beneficial to our town and would help them in moving some of the projects which they want to go forward with. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Swomley.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Mr. Speaker, for the second time, I'd like to ask a question to Mr. Serrani?

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed sir.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Would it be possible now for a town to enter into an agreement with the State if it was willing to pay 100 percent on a State highway construction within that town?

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Serrani.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Through you sir, no and that is the purpose of the bill.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Thank you. I would again like to emphasize that this bill is an option to the towns of the State. We have been waiting for 15 or 20 years in our town for an important road. We have not been able to get that road because other roads in the state have a higher priority. We are willing to pay our share of the costs if this particular legislation is passed. We hope that we will have that opportunity and I urge a yes vote on this bill. Thank you.

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

79
teg

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you remark further? Gentleman from the 116th.

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Mr. Speaker, commenting on the bill, it does bring up all the questions that people have mentioned here today. There is the question that would the State renege on paying the 15 percent and I think if you read the legislation you'll see that this is a distinct possibility. But let's look what has happened in this State. You look at what you get in the mail from the Connecticut Construction Industry. We have not gone forth with the urban systems projects. There was about a year or two delay. In fact, in the rates in Bridgeport, because of a mix up and bureacratic part of the regional planning agency about a couple of years ago, they almost lost the federal funds. What this bill will do will allow a town that says I want to build a road and I want the Federal money and if the State doesn't come up with the money, I'll pay it myself. And so for towns that want to move their road projects, they want to get some construction in this State, I would vote in favor of this bill. Will the Department of Transportation renege on projects? We hope that they will not but in the past the towns have found that they can not get these projects moving because the State will not come up with their 15 percent and many towns are willing to pay this themselves and for that reason, I would vote in favor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to do so too.

House of Representatives

Friday, May 20, 1977

80
teg

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Belden.

MR. BELDEN (113th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just one other point on this particular bill. It was touched on by Representative Reynolds and that is if the Federal Government has allocated X amount of dollars for urban systems, the problem being that evidently in many cases during the past two years, the State has not allocated sufficient monies to match the Federal funds that are available. And many of the towns are out there getting a little bit itchy, as well as our construction industry. There is another check in here that has not been mentioned up to this point and that is that no matter where the application comes from and no matter if the town puts in the 30 percent or only the 15 percent, the Department of Transportation still has the final say in the ranking of priorities in which will go to the Federal Government to be approved. So depending upon the amount of money the State allocates the Commissioner of Transportation will be able to both work the list of priorities to those towns that are not so fortunate to have the total amount of monies as well as those who do. And I think it's a good bill and it makes the whole issue flexible and I support its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you remark further? If not, will the members please take their seats, will the Staff and guests please come to the

S-120

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 1
1-416
INDEX

Wednesday, March 2, 1977

55

jgt

any effect that it would have on any of the marinas. In the first place, the Harbormaster, I believe, is in New London. There's one in New Haven, there's one in Bridgeport and I believe there's one in Stamford, but the purpose of the thing was not in any way to affect the marinas and I know of no impact or effect that it would have on any marina.

THE CHAIR:

Matter has been moved to the Consent Calendar. Do I hear objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page 4 of the Calendar, second item from the top, Calendar 45, File No. 11, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation. Senate Bill No. 344. AN ACT CONCERNING THE FEDERAL AID URBAN SYSTEM FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN CONNECTICUT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS:

May I have just one second, Mr. President?

THE CHAIR:

Certainly.

SENATOR OWENS:

I believe there's an amendment in this matter also, and I would ask adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Is that the same thing?

Wednesday, March 2, 1977

56

jgt

THE CLERK:

Clerk has Senate Amendment Schedule A, Senate Bill No. 344, File No. 11, LCO 3, excuse me, LCO 6127.

SENATOR OWENS:

That adoption of the amendment. All it does is change the effective day to July 1, 1977 from the present "effective on passage," as it is drawn at the present. I'd ask adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? If not the question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule A. All in favor say aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. Amendment is adopted.

SENATOR OWENS:

Move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended and if there's no objection that it be placed on the Consent Calendar. Very briefly, Mr. President, what this bill does, it allows the municipality, only if it wants to to pick up the non-federal share and in the event that the state did not have the funds available or for some reasons was not coming up with the state's share, then it would allow the municipality with the option to the municipality alone to match the federal share whether it be 70-30 or 90-10 situation. For these reasons, I - it's a good bill and I urge its passage as amended.

THE CHAIR:

You've heard the explanation. Will you remark further? If not, the matter has been moved as amended to the Consent Calendar and is so ordered.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION
PART 1
1-373

1977
INDEX

TRANSPORTATION

JANUARY 24, 1977

10:00 A.M.

ROBERT NYSER: I believe that the present law accepts them. In other words, they do get this waiver of examination fee for that purpose. I believe they do.

REPRESENTATIVE McKENNA: It is my understanding that municipal drivers, the question was brought up about fees, it is my understanding that their license is marked for municipal vehicles only so there wouldn't be the problem of moonlighting.

ROBERT NYSER: I am sorry I don't know, Representative McKenna, I don't know that for a fact. Some one from Motor Vehicle might be able to shed some light on that.

The next act I would like to discuss is No. 344. This bill is a little bit technical. It involves a problem that has come up recently with the Department of Transportation. It involves the system of highways known as the Federal Aid Urban System. These are highways basically located in a town or a city. These projects are initiated by towns or cities and it involves basically improvements to the Federal Aid Urban System of roads within that town.

The vast majority of these projects are cost-sharing with the Federal share being 70%; the State share being 15%; and the town's or city's share being 15%. In the recent past, because of financial restraints, the Department has not been able to appropriate its 15% share of certain project costs. As a consequence some projects have been deferred. The towns that have been involved have expressed a willingness to pay the State's share, to pay both the town's and the State's share. That is to say, pick up the two 15% portions and pay 30%. There are no existing laws that permit this to be done.

We propose amending this bill so that this could be brought about. This amendment would not abrogate any Federal regulations or laws that exist now. In fact, Federal regulations are specific as to what their share will be and are really not too concerned with what political entity or entities pay the remainder.

We do have a system of checks and balances on this. The State, as policy, requires any town or city sharing with us in the cost of a project, to deposit its share of the cost of the project with the State before construction bids are received. Bids are not in fact asked for until we have all monies in hand. We believe we could safeguard them a town backing out of the program halfway through the proposed program.

Wealthy towns or cities would not benefit particularly by this bill since all projects selected under this program must be approved under a Transportation Improvement Program, what we call TIP, by regional planning agencies, by appropriate Federal

TRANSPORTATION

JANUARY 24, 1977

10:00 A.M.

agencies and there is really no chance that one town or city really could monopolize a disproportionate share of the Federal funds. Priorities for this type of program are based on a functional need, not on the basis of available local funds.

If I could summarize just briefly, what I am saying is that because of financial restraints we have not been able to match our share of some project costs. The towns have expressed a willingness to pay for this, their share and our share, in order to get the project done. We would ask that this legislation be passed to permit this to be done.

REPRESENTATIVE PUGLIESE: I may be wrong but it is my understanding that the Urban Systems funding from the Federal government is allocated by states, a certain amount of money to the states (inaudible) That being the case, it does seem to me that the municipalities who are willing to pick up 30% of the cost value would have a better opportunity to get the project going. When you stop to consider the fact that the ones who could not do that, then automatically do not have a share of that funding so the funding would then be allocated to those towns who could do it.

ROBERT NYSER: Just briefly, if I can go back. All towns are told that they can submit projects that they want for their particular towns. These projects are sent to the local regional planning agencies, not the town agencies - I am sorry the regional planning agencies which of course involves anywhere from ten to upwards of thirty towns within a region. The projects within that regional planning area are selected on the basis of priority by the regional agencies, not by the towns. They are from a list of projects submitted by the towns. Priorities as to what should be built first and what should be funded first is determined at the regional level and not at the local level. So although a town may have the money, if its project is not on a priority list, it will not get funded.

REPRESENTATIVE PUGLIESE: Well I think we are talking about projects that are on the priority list. I am sure there are an ample number of them on the priority list that are not being funded.

ROBERT NYSER: This is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PUGLIESE: Because there is not enough money to do so.

ROBERT NYSER: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PUGLIESE: Now, in light of that, I would think that this would give a better opportunity to those communities who could afford to put up 30%.

JANUARY 24, 1977

10:00 A.M.

ROBERT NYSER: The Department doesn't see more than one project in any town where this would ever happen. The one project that I can think of right now is the Town of Bloomfield which has a project it urgently needs. It is on the priority list and we are unable to fund at the moment and they are willing to fund. Are there other comments?

REPRESENTATIVE ROSSO: (Inaudible)

ROBERT NYSER: It is permissive. It would be initiated by the town. We wouldn't go to the town and say "Hey, if you put up the money we'll go ahead." It is up to the town to say "We would like to do it if we can."

While we are on the subject of urban systems, I would like to discuss 351, AN ACT PROVIDING FUNDS FOR A TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN STAMFORD. Stamford was one of a number of cities in the United States that was used as a pilot city for the implementation of the Traffic Operations Program to Improve Capacity and Safety, so-called TOPICS. As such, all of the past TOPICS programs and its successor Urban Systems programs in the City of Stamford have been funded 100% by the State and Federal government.

Other cities and towns in Connecticut are benefiting from these same programs as well with the significant difference being that the other municipalities have contributed either 15% or 25% depending upon the program, 15% or 25% of the costs of the project in their jurisdictions. This bill would place Stamford in the same status as all other municipalities, thereby requiring Stamford to contribute to the project costs. The Department considers this to be fair and equitable as the pilot stage of these programs has long since past.

Stamford has benefited as a pilot city since 1969 with more than \$2,400,000 expended for projects in the City. It is expected that by July 1st of this year, another \$2,100,000 will be under agreement. If Stamford had been participating in these programs in the same manner as all of the other municipalities throughout the State, their share of the cost of these programs would have been \$1,000,000. Instead the State has paid or will pay this amount of money.

The Department believes that the experimental or pilot stage is long over. The General Assembly has passed enabling legislation in 1969. The program has been ongoing since that time. Approximately 65 towns and cities are or have been involved in TOPICS and Urban Systems programs with all, except Stamford, contributing to the cost of the projects.

We also suggest that the effective date of this bill be moved forward to October 1, 1977, bringing it in line with the Federal

JANUARY 24, 1977

10:00 A.M.

There is just one sentence here that I think is worth quoting. "In effect, because DOT wants to put up one sign in one place, it has sought authority to put up any sign anywhere in the State. If the Committee permits this, it will have allowed DOT by administrative action, to repeal P.A. 75-220."

So, in conclusion, my own sense of this, I guess the Committee on the basis of the statements made earlier are familiar with the history and purpose of the legislation, I think that on its face it is extremely overbroad, much more general than would be needed for the stated purpose, and the rest of my remarks go in suggesting that I think the stated purpose itself is an unfound and unnecessary purpose, discriminatory, and I would also lend my voice to the others I have quoted here in urging you to defeat this bill.

I only have one copy left but I want to place on record with the Committee a picture of the signs that were previously in use. It was not a legal action but DOT in its own initiative in violation of the statute as it previously stood, as it stands now, did have some signs up in front of Norwich and there was some discussion, some negotiation with Attorney Lerner's Office in response to which they took it down. So I have a couple of articles here outlining that situation which I will leave with the Committee.

In conclusion, my sense is given the fact that DOT wants this broad authority and asserts that it will exercise authority with extreme discretion, caution and so forth, I think that the stated purpose for which they want this acted in the first place and the purpose for which they would use it itself is an indication of an abuse of discretion. It is made on no rational basis whatsoever. It is simply a response to one request without any form of deliberation or public hearing and on that basis DOT would have substantial authority if this bill were to be passed. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Any questions? Thank you. Anyone else here that would like to speak on any of the bills?

EARL ANDERSON: I am Earl Anderson representing United Illuminating, Bridgeport and New Haven, Connecticut area, and I would like to speak briefly on 344, FEDERAL URBAN SYSTEMS FOR HIGHWAYS IN CONNECTICUT, particularly the part which refers to reimbursement or non-reimbursement of the utility, roughly on line 62 for those of you who wish to follow it, indicating that we may be in effect required to readjust, relocate or remove the utility facilities at its own expense; that is, at the utility's expense. I submit to you, Members of the Committee, that this may not be ultimately in the best interests of the

100
eac

TRANSPORTATION

100

JANUARY 24, 1977

10:00 A.M.

rate payers. From the surface it seems like a good idea because it would seem to be saving the taxpayers of Connecticut money because the utility pays for it. But as you well know, the utility's costs of course are the rate payers costs, and this ultimately is borne by those who pay the electricity that they use, or other utilities in the case of gas.

If we in turn, and I only submit this to you with thought, if we were allowed to recover the costs of such changes, this in turn - as I seem to recall from earlier testimony here today by a gentleman from DOT - would be reimbursable up to 70% from Federal funds. Granted, that too comes from the taxpayers, but it does seem a way of getting some of the money that is flowing out of Connecticut to the Federal government back. And in the final analysis, I believe that the rate payers, taxpayers, who are really one and the same people, would save money. I know you have a time problem and in my testimony there I would only request that perhaps I could be in touch with other utilities in the State and we could come back to you at a further date with some facts and figures and even perhaps suggested wording changes.

REPRESENTATIVE SWEENEY: Thank you Mr. Anderson. Are there any questions? I declare the hearing closed.