

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 5450	(^{vetoed} PA 77-413)	1977
Senate:	2923-2924	(2)
House:	3075-3081, 6957-6963	(14)
Transportation:	208-210, 232-233, 696	(6)
	total	22 p.

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2016

S-126

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 30
PART 7
240-2964

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

78
LFU

Impact Evaluations. It would validate all actions taken by the Commissioner between February 1st, 1975 and the passage of this Bill and reaffirm the Commissioner's obligation to comply with an Environmental Impact Law after passage of the Bill. In addition, the Bill would enable municipalities to proceed with municipal development projects without the approval of the Commissioner of Commerce if no state planning grant had been made and no State Development Grant had been made or will be applied for.

The statutes presently require municipalities to obtain the approval of the Commissioner before adopting the municipal development plan before selling or leasing land in the project area. House Amendment A adds provisions relating to Environmental Impact Statements and changes the effective date from October 1, 1977 to the date of passage.

Madam President, if there is no objection, I would move this to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objection, so moved. Senator Madden? Hearing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR BAKER:

Madam President, I believe we skipped Calendar

THE CLERK:

Calendar 953 had been marked go but then I was told to pass retain. Continuing to page thirteen of the Calendar, top item on the page, Calendar 955, File 755 and 1050, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary, Substitute for House Bill 5450, AN ACT CONCERNING PEDESTRIAN'S RIGHTS AND DUTIES, as amended by House Amendment, Schedule A.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY

MAY 25, 1977

79
LFU

THE CHAIR: (Senator Fauliso in the Chair.)

Senator Madden.

SENATOR MADDEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, I ask for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill as amended by House Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR MADDEN:

Yes, Mr. President, very briefly. Under our present laws, the rights and responsibilities of the pedestrians and motorists in relation to their respective use of intersections only at locations controlled by traffic signals and pedestrian control signals. This Bill would establish rights and responsibilities for pedestrians and motorists in situations involving cross walks not controlled by such signals. And if there is no objection, I would move that the Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing none, so ordered. Senator Beck, will you please assume the Chair?

THE CLERK:

Continuing on page thirteen of the Calendar, Calendar 958, Files 857, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary, Substitute for House Bill 8085, AN ACT CONCERNING ERASURE OF RECORDS CONCERNING PERSONS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY WAY OF MENTAL DISEASE OR DEFECT.

THE CHAIR: (Senator Beck in the Chair.)

Senator Guidera.

H-189

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1977

VOL. 20
PART 8
2979-3432

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

13
teg
(rec.3)

MR. CARRAGHER (5th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any objection? Hearing none, the bill is passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Page seven of the Calendar, Cal. no.848, H.B. 6311, file 725, An Act Concerning State Approval for Municipal Development Projects, Favorable Report of the Committee on Government Administration and Policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Carragher.

MR. CARRAGHER (5th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any objection? Hearing none, the matter is passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 854, substitute for H.B. No. 5450, file 755, An Act Concerning Pedestrian's Rights and Duties, Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 116th.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

14
teg

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, L.C.O. 6989. Will the Clerk please call and read this amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call and read L.C.O. 6989, House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A. L.C.O. 6989, offered by Representative Reynolds of the 116th district, in line five after the word "any" insert the following words: "crosswalk marked as provided in subsection (a) of the section of any". Add a new section six as follows: "Sec. 6 (NEW) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to limit the provisions of section 53-181 of the general statutes or to permit any pedestrian to walk upon or along any highway where pedestrians are prohibited by any provision of the general statutes or any regulations issued thereunder."

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the amendment. What is your pleasure?

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

15
teg

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on adoption of House A and will you remark sir?

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, what this amendment does is clear up some miswording that occurred in line five of the drafting and section six points out that this bill in no way this amendment interferes with our hitch hiking law.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House A? If not, the question's on adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor of House A will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it. House A is adopted and ruled technical. Will you remark on the bill as amendment?

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, what this bill does is build into Connecticut law some rules and regulations concerning our pedestrian's. Earlier this year in the Transportation Committee we're discussing going to the western rule of right turn on red light. What developed was much opposition from our elderly and from blind people saying we can't do this because the Connecticut pedestrian laws are atrocious. And upon investigating by the Committee we found that we are one of three states that do not

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

16
teg

protect our pedestrians. Forty-seven other states protect pedestrians. In this state, I don't know if you've ever driven in the midwest but when I say this, I, myself too, are guilty, if a pedestrian happens to be in a crosswalk and the light is changed and there not a police officer there, they have absolutely no rights. And what happens is they usually end up with a rear end full of fender. We've had two thousand accidents a year, about a hundred deaths of pedestrians. What this bill attempts to do is that if a pedestrian is in a crosswalk, whether the light is with him or against him, whether he's right or wrong, the motorist will stop. The pedestrian in no way can be in competition to the person driving the car because obviously the person driving the car has a great advantage. And what we would like to do is bring our pedestrian laws into formance with National standards. If a pedestrian is jay walking, then he has no rights, the auto has rights and the pedestrian does not have rights in jay walking. The bill also goes further on to state that if a person is on a side walk and an auto crosses that sidewalk pulling into a driveway, then the pedestrian has rights over the auto. I don't know if you have driven in other parts of our country where this is acceptable, where pedestrian does have rights. Also in the bill it might be ambiguous, it says that pedestrians will walk to the right of the crosswalk. This is simply the same as walking to the right going up and down a stairway. It's a good bill, Mr. Speaker. It brings Connecticut into conformity with forty-seven other states and protects our people. It will be a benefit to the elderly who have

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

17
teg

often complained that our walk lights are too short and they can't make it across the crosswalk and I move its passage and adoption and I'll answer any questions members may have concerning this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Lady from the 133rd.

MRS. WILBER (133rd):

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Speaking briefly in support of the bill, I would like to assure the members who are opposed to the right turn on red light in this assembly that this and that bill are not connected. They were connected in the sense that Representative Reynolds said, in the Committee's minds because we knew we could not have right turn on red light without a pedestrians bill. But with no pedestrian bill in this state, we are subjecting our elderly, our handicapped and in fact every person walking in the State to an unnecessary position of danger. It seems to me that this is a sound bill and conforms to the states surrounding us as well as most every state in the union. I would recommend its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Swomley of the 17th.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

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

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

18
teg

MR. SPEAKER:

Please frame your question.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Yes, would you please distinguish for me the difference between a marked and an unmarked crosswalk?

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 116th care to respond.

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, you read in the file copy in which it points out a mistake in the drafting and in amendment A, L.CO. 6989 which we just adopted clarifies this and corrects this error.

MR. SWOMLEY (17th):

Thank you sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will members please be seated, 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	143
Necessary for Passage	72

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 11, 1977

19
teg

Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	8

MR. SPEAKER:

The bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 855, substitute for H.B. No. 6744, file 769.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 5th.

MR. CARRAGHER (5th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any objections? Hearing none, the matter is passed temporarily.

THE CLERK:

Cal. no. 858, H.B. No. 5508, file 767, An Act Concerning Liability of Employees of District Departments of Health, Favorable Report of the Committee on Government Administration and Policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 105th.

MR. PAWLAK (105th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

H-197

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1977
SPEC. SESS.
JULY

VOL. 20
PART 16
6517-6977

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977 50
teg

THE CLERK:

Total number voting140
 Necessary for Repassage101
 Those voting Yea111
 Those voting Nay 29
 Those absent and not voting 11

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion for repassage carries. The veto is over-
 ridden as of this chamber. Will the Clerk please call Public
 Act 77-413.

THE CLERK:

Public Act 77-413, substitute for House Bill number
5450, file 755, 1060, An Act Concerning Pedestrian's Rights
 and Duties.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 34th.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for reconsideration of Special
 Act 77-413, substitute House Bill 5450, file 755 and 1060.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the motion of the Gentleman from the 34th.
 Will you remark? If not, the question's on the motion. All

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

51
teg

those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The motion for reconsideration carries. The Chair at this time will entertain a motion for repassage.

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Gentleman from the 116th, Representative Russell Reynolds.

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance and repassage of public act 77-413, substitute House Bill 5450.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question's on repassage of public Act 77-413, substitute House Bill 5450 and will you remark sir?

MR. REYNOLDS (116th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a product of the Transportation Committee's work this year concerning the pedestrian's rights and duties. This state along with many others is moving towards right turn on red light as a means of traffic control and of energy saving. But while the Transportation Committee was going throughout this state, we find in many of the elderly, the blind and the handicapped were quite apprehensive concerning right turn on red lights because of

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

52
teg

the current state of the pedestrian laws in this state. Today we are one in three of the fifty states which gives no protection to the pedestrian in an unmarked crosswalk. The Committee felt that the move this year on this bill and bring some curiosity and some sense into our driving habits and give the pedestrians a right and duties was the logical step in the right direction. The Governor in her veto message limited itself to the problems of negligence and litigation concerning infractions of these rules and to counteract it, I would like to quote from Carl Land who is the head of the Connecticut Safety Commission. Concerning this bill he says, the clause outlining pedestrians rights and responsibilities an unsignalized intersection is the most vital portion of this act. The past accidents records show that half of Connecticut's annual 80 to 100 fatalities to pedestrians occurs at these intersections. We believe that a lack of a clear precise law stating what pedestrians relationship with motor vehicles and drivers have contributed to this total. Neither the pedestrian nor the driver can feel confident of what the other will do or should do at such a location when there is no law. Offering no lights in effect will tell the pedestrian to take a chance and if a pedestrian in taking such a chance ultimately responds by taking a risk and therefore we have 80 to 100 deaths a year. I urge the repassage of this bill over the Governor's veto and move this state with conformity

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

53
teg
(rec.7)

with the National Vehicle Code, uniform vehicle code so that our elderly and our handicapped have rights in an intersection. The current situation in this state is better get up on the curb because we're going to hit you and you have no rights anyways. I suggest we repass this bill and change that and give the people who are caught in traffic some rights and also duties. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BELDEN (113th):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

For further remarks, Gentleman from the 113th.

MR. BELDEN (113th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, as Representative Reynolds has indicated, the Transportation Committee has spend considerable time on this particular legislation and just to add one or two more points. You know we send our police into our local school systems to teach the kids about how to cross our streets but would you believe that we really don't have any laws defining how to cross the streets if there's not a marked intersection. This particular legislation will bring Connecticut in line with almost all of the balance of the state s of these United States. I think in this particular area of law, the sooner

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

54
teg

all of our states have the same law, the easier it will be, a very mobile society, the easier it will be for our people to move around and know that whether they are in Indianapolis or Texas, that when they are at an intersection, they know what their rights are. I would urge that this particular, on this particular issue, that we override the veto.

MR. SPEAKER:

For further remarks, Gentleman from the 144th, Representative Thomas Serrani.

MR. SERRANI (144th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think the comments have been made. I'm standing in favor of the bill, in favor of the override. I think Representative Reynolds and the Transportation Committee did a great service to the Committee and to this state by working very hard on this piece of legislation. I would hope that this chamber would give an unanimous vote as they did previous to the veto. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

For further remarks, Gentleman from the 82nd.

MR. BENNETT (82nd):

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to ask your support to override the veto. Now this bill not only speaks to the rights of the pedestrians and crosswalks but also to the rights of the pedestrians on the (inaudible). We're going to have more

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

55
teg

and more pedestrians on our streets and roads as the energy shortage continues. Many motorists virtually challenge the pedestrian at crosswalks, gunning their engines and trying to get across immediately after the pedestrian has crossed in front of his path. And I urge the support for this bill. I think the reasons that common sense will prevail is a reason for recalling this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

For further remarks, Gentleman from the 114th.

MR. TABER (114th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask you to overturn the veto. We have more and more people who are out on the roads either in motorcycles, bikes, jogging, every form, what ever you can have, whatever you want to name. We drive up and down the streets and we see bumper stickers that say I brake for animals. Maybe in fact, we might have bumper stickers that say I brake for people.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the motion for repassage? If not, will the members please be seated? 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.

House of Representatives

Monday, July 25, 1977

56
teg

THE CLERK:

Total number voting139
 Necessary for Repassage101
 Those voting Yea129
 Those voting Nay 10
 Those absent and not voting 12

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion for repassage carries. The veto is over-
 ridden as of this chamber. Will the Clerk please call Public
 Act 77-423.

THE CLERK:

Public Act 77-423, House Bill number 7332, file 861,
 An Act Concerning Regional Planning Agencies, vetoed June
 20th, 1977.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 34th.

MR. O'NEILL (34th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for reconsideration of Public Act
 77-423, House Bill number 7332, file 861.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the motion of the Gentleman from the 34th.
 Will you remark? If not, the question is on the motion. All

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION
PART 1
1-373

1977
INDEX

Feb. 23, 1977
10:00 a.m.

27
PB

REP. HOFMEISTER: Is the \$700,000 you gain on the

ED MICKIEWICZ: No, legate ... \$1 Million is a result of the cash increase and \$300,000 because of the ... and \$3 Million between the two.

REP. HOFMEISTER: So, what you find is approximately 25% reduction ...

ED MICKIEWICZ ... been a previous increase, yes ...

5451 is An Act Removing the Tolls From the Putnam Bridge. There are two areas that we'd like to address on this one for our opposition: One is that, it's been estimated that the removal of tolls did not increase the traffic on the Bridge by more than 5%, which would be about 700 vehicles a day total-wise. It would result in the loss of approximately \$2 to \$300,000 in revenue and -- again we must address the personnel of approximately 29 people. So the Department would request an unfavorable based on these viewpoints, but we will attach our position and also the statements that back up the dollar loss and the traffic changes on this.

REP. BELDEN: When will we have them?

ED MICKIEWICZ: They will be submitted today. Thank you.

REP. SWEENEY: The Putnam Bridge -- is that the one (inaudible due to someone continually coughing into or around the microphone)...

ED MICKIEWICZ: No. It's the Glastonbury (not clear)

REP. SWEENEY: Thank you very much. Mr. Frank D'Addabbo, DOT?

FRANK D'ADDABBO: I'm Frank D'Addabbo, Manager of the Traffic Department of Transportation: This is in regards to Bill 5450 -- An Act Concerning the Right of Way of Pedestrians In A Crosswalk.

The Department of Transportation is opposed to establishing a statutory right of way for pedestrians crossing highways within a crosswalk. The revisions to sub-Section (b) of Section 14-300 and particularly the additions in lines 31 and 32 greatly concerns this Department; in researching the Uniform Vehicle Code as published by the National Committee On Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, attempts to establish uniformity in traffic laws and ordinances, the guidelines of the Code suggest that this type of crossing law not be permitted.

The law could very easily be construed to permit pedestrians

Feb. 23, 1977
10:00 a.m.

28
PB

to cross a highway in a hazardous manner. Nothing in this bill precludes a pedestrian from starting across a highway in a manner that would endanger the pedestrian as well as the oncoming driver and vehicle.

A vehicle travelling at 30 miles an hour is moving at 44 ft. per second; so the actual breaking time results in a minimum of 200 feet of roadway to safely stop the vehicle. Many people -- especially children -- who have not driven or who are not aware of the characteristic of a car are then unable to judge whether it is proper to cross a road. Certainly, weather conditions would compound this situation. For this reason of potential for accidents, this Department opposes this bill. Thank you.

REP. BELDEN: It seems there are a number of other states that presently have this law. Also, this Committee is considering legislation which involves on red lights... do you think they're comments concerning the accident rates have you been getting comments concerning the accident rates from the other states that currently have the law...?

MR. D'ADDABBO: In checking some of the other states and in particular contacting the Uniform Vehicle Code which is in Washington and speaking to the gentleman who works in regard to this area; he mentioned a few other states that had the law and he said it's a very difficult law to enforce and he would call it a very ineffective law. Of course, not being legal I don't know too much about the legal end of it, but this has been mentioned to me. In particular, the accidents as they relate to accidents of pedestrians I can only relate to some of the accidents that have occurred in Connecticut and it seems from the information that I have that it is not a problem at crosswalks.

There were 38 accidents in '76 that cross or enter the roadway but not at intersections and 9 at intersections that it occurred, and 8 they were not sure of how they occurred. So, I would say that I don't particularly think it is a problem and our present laws are directed at signalized locations where the vehicle has to yield to the pedestrian.

In checking some other states like Virginia and Delaware, they've been looking at the law as far as it addresses itself to pedestrians and it seems they choose to stay away from granting the pedestrian the sovereign right of way. They'd rather give the vehicle the authority to yield to that pedestrian; and it seems that the majority of states direct their law in that fashion.

Feb. 23, 1977
10:00 a.m.

29
PB

REP. BELDEN: How would a person ... (inaudible) How would our elderly persons get across the street? They would never have the opportunity to get across the street unless (inaudible) intersection.

MR. D'ADDABBO: Of course under the red we address ourselves to ... the vehicle must stop before he proceeds, making a right turn. That's Number One. And, in imposing a right turn on red to take into consideration the number of pedestrians that will be crossing at that location; that's another warrant that we look out for. If there are elderly in the area and a large amount of pedestrians crossing we would probably restrict the right turn at that location. Where we do allow it, we address ourselves to ... in the law that the vehicle shall yield to the pedestrian. So it's written in the law for that ... when it address itself ... right turn on the red.

REP. SWEENEY: Thank you. Joseph Trantino?

JOSEPH TRANTINO: I'm Joseph Trantino, Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, Bureau of Auto Rights. I'm here to speak on one bill, Gentlemen, the Department's opposition to Bill 228 which is An Act Concerning the Allocation of Revenue Obtained From the State Pier At New London. Our position, of course, is in opposition to it.

The Department feels that a very dangerous precedent is set by the bill regarding the State's in lieu of tax grants... I'll take this in two parts. It's difficult following Senator Schneller who introduced this bill and the favorable things he said about it; but we feel that a Pandora's box is in this bill. The State failed, for example, in the fiscal year ending 1974 returns to the State ... General Treasury General Fund ... approximately \$70,000 in cash flow. In the fiscal year ending '75 returned just about a little over \$50,000. In the fiscal year ending '76 the cash flow was over \$220,000. Shortly -- and Mrs. O'Connor of our Department will be handing you the package on this -- our written package of my statement and the opposition in the figures projected into the coming fiscal year where the 50% revenues would be approximately \$100,000 for the City of New London.

We feel there's a lot of spin-off benefit in State operation. And the figures here as I mentioned -- we have employment there in the form of longshoremen ... there were approximately, on an average, with ship unloadings about 35-40 men employed in the year '74 and '75. In the year ending in '76 and in the current year we're employing on the average of over 100 to 125. The spin-off benefit in

51
53
PBFeb. 23, 1977
10:00 a.m.

How will this affect the international registration program? Because I'd be very much concerned because, you're going to have a situation here where we're going to further drive business out of the State and I just hope that it'll be clarified so that you don't have a duplication.

Insofar as commercial vehicles are concerned, I think the law has a stand ... as it stands right now, perfectly proper. Now, the intent of this to ... just passenger cars on approximately the same basis, if it were amended to that effect, then I think maybe you'd have it clarified. Rather than following ... rather than fooling around with the other sections of the commercial vehicles laws as they are now worded.

SENATOR OWENS: (inaudible)

MR. BLASKO: Now we get to Committee Bill 5498 - An Act Requiring Side Mud Guards On Trucks and Buses. I'm not going to go into detail with the whole thing; I'd like to just pass this out to members of the Committee. Something in the newspapers came up just the other day, and it showed that spray also is developed by passenger cars. Because of this I have checked with White Ford Mack International trucks. In summarizing it it comes out that the cost is about \$75 a quarter fender is \$120 and a full fender is \$390 to \$559 plus installation. Getting down to the bottom line: the estimated cost would vary because of the nature of the vehicles and the number of tire walls which you'd have to close in; the cost would average \$300 per truck or a bus, at total cost to the State of Connecticut -- truck operators and bus operators -- of \$45 Million Dollars. The cost of school bus operators would be -- the 6,000 school bus operators in the State -- would be approximately \$1,800,000 and if you extended the application of this logically to passenger cars you're talking about a cost of somewhere in the area of \$100 to \$150,000,000.... (another voice, laughter) ... all right (snickers)... Are there any questions?

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

NELSON DOUGLAS: Senator Owens, Representative Sweeney, Members of the Transportation Committee: My name is Nelson Douglas, I'm the Executive Director of the Connecticut Safety Commission, and I'd like to address myself to Bill 5450 - An Act Concerning the Right of Way of Pedestrians In A Crosswalk.

First of all, the Connecticut Safety Commission is generally in favor of giving the pedestrian more right of way. There seems to be some confusion with this bill

52
54
PB

Feb. 23, 1977
10:00 a.m.

here. The bill says the Pedestrian shall be given the right of way. Mr. D'Addabbo from the Department of Transportation testified earlier against this bill and he mentioned the uniform vehicle code. I have on file with Representative Sweeney our version of the pedestrian right of way bill which is actually a duplicate of the uniform vehicle code version. And it says in there that the driver of the vehicle shall slow down or stop if need be or yield to a pedestrian in a right of way which isn't signalized. Actually, our bill goes a lot further than this 5450. There are many items in our bill.....

SENATOR OWENS: You have another bill.....

MR. DOUGLAS: Yes. It hasn't been raised. I talked with Representative Sweeney about it ...

SENATOR OWENS: It hasn't been raised...?

MR. DOUGLAS: No.

SEN. OWENS: Was it ever submitted to the Legislative Commissioner's Office

MR. DOUGLAS: I'm not sure of the status of it... I gave it to Representative Sweeney sometime ago and he indicated to me that he didn't think there'd be any problem with raising it. I think that Representative Sweeney could clarify that.

Going further. Like our said, our bill has actually many items in it which we think are very good, which will give the pedestrian taken the back door in this picture: he's sort of the forgotten man. For example, every pedestrian crossing a roadway or anything other than a marked crossway or unmarked crossway shall yield the right of way to all vehicles What our bill does is clarify the rights and also the duties of pedestrians.

I would like to review the pedestrian safety area. Our Commission is considerably with the school children and one of the things that we do, we take the laws and make them up into a pedestrian safety pamphlet. For example last year we distributed 130,000 of these mainly to the schools and let the teachers do educational ... this is one of our main resources -- the teachers teaching safety in the schools. We did the same thing with bicycle safety. So many of the things in our bill greatly increases the teaching of pedestrians in schools throughout the State. So we think it's a good bill and would be in strict conformance with the uniform vehicle code.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION
PART 2
374-714

1977

SENATOR OWENS: But you share a concern of many, particularly handicaps, who have been have been deployed in community and blinded, but comment has said that, you know, they are familiar with the laws in California and how well they have worked there because there is genuine pedestrian,

MR. CAVALLERO: Observance.

SENATOR OWENS: Observance, and that the law is more vigorously enforced. I wonder if you, I mean of the agenda we have 5450 which is An Act Concerning the Right of Way of Pedestrians on a Crosswalk, and we've added to that that the language at any crosswalk not controlled by a police officer at the traffic signal or special pedestrian control signal, that they would have the right of way over the vehicles. I wonder if that was enacted, would that change your idea on it do you think?

MR. CAVALLERO: I saw that Bill and I was going to refrain from commenting on it because I really am not an attorney and don't understand the nuances of the language. It appears to me it'd be a stronger pedestrian law and if that's so I would certainly recommend it and support it myself.

SENATOR OWENS: Fine. Because there was some feeling that maybe we should strengthen the enforcement regulations with respect to the pedestrian laws.

MR. CAVALLERO: Yes, I agree with that.

SENATOR OWENS: And with respect to the automobiles that use the intersections and then if we're going to do a right turn on red then maybe we should do it and let it take effect in a year or two or three, maybe that might be the way. You don't see a great deal of hope as far as enforcement, is that what you're saying?

SB345

MR. CAVALLERO: I don't see that and I'd also want to mention in addition to the handicaps and the blind that you added, I could point out other problem areas with right turn on red. For example, a driver is coming down a main artery now and encounters a red signal. Under today's operation he stops and waits for it to be green. Under the right turn on red rule what can happen is he simply makes a right turn down a residential street and bypasses the traffic signal and what you have is a nightmare for your mayors and local traffic authorities in trying to stop these inroads into residential areas.

The theory here, you traffic control is to keep your heavy traffic on your main routes and to signalize those provide maximum traffic and parking controls and