



JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

TRANSPORTATION  
PART 1  
11-292

1978  
INDEX

20  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. SERRANI: But you're not really speaking against the bill particularly. You're speaking against it with caution...

REP. QUINN: Well -- it would have been against it. 283 I just read this morning and I feel I'm just cautioning the Committee on what judgment it will go.

REP. SWEENEY: Any other questions? Thank you. (INAUDIBLE)

ED MCDONALD: My name is Ed McDonald. I'm speaking on behalf of Sister Claire Markham, Under Secretary for the Energy Division of Office of Policy And Management. Sister Claire is with the Governor in Washington today on a solar energy grant and shes asked me to speak in favor of House Bill 5045. My address is 30 Woodland Street, Hartford, Connecticut. Legislation for generally permissive right turn on red light is a mandatory part of our state energy conservation plan which is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy. As a mandatory part of that plan, we span to gain funding in the coming fiscal year of \$991,000 if we can as a state implement a right turn on red ---. The indications are from other states that some of the area figures given on the number of signs that will be required are perhaps excessive. In any case, under this funding we could also make funds available for general public education aimed at Connecticut drivers to acquaint them with right turn on red. There is one piece of research which has been done in Virginia which indicates that 90% of the signalized inter-sections did not require signs.

I would like to mention timing on the bill. We would like to see implementation commence at the time of an action assuming the bill is cleared and is passed by the legislation. We have passed out a resume giving reference to some of our own research. I won't go into the actual energy savings that this would accomplish for Connecticut but I think it will speak for itself in the hand out you've been given. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

REP. SWEENEY: Representative Henderson.

REP. HENDERSON: Yes. We have problems with --. It seems to me that (INAUDIBLE) and more or less saying that the funding is tied in with this --. The merits of the bill are not really being considered. We should look at the ---.  
(INAUDIBLE)

21  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. HENDERSON (Continued): I can't see where the rest of the country has gone along because of the federal -- that the same commitment should change -- which identifies those --intersections, a right turn on red light would be of use in ---. --- change it and make it a condition that we would have to sign those intersections where it would not be ---, because it would be prohibited. I can't see why, because --or the other, the energy savings would be so dramatically increased --. And incidentally -- I think it should be pointed out very strongly that the City of Washington, D.C. is another area of the country that has not gone along with this type of legislation, mainly because their dollars are ---. So they --

ED MCDONALD: I by no means am suggesting that this bill be passed just so funding will be allowed. I think the Committee must realize the vulnerable position...

22  
gbs

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. McDONALD (Continued): I did not mean to imply that the Belt sole reason that the Office of Policy & Management and Energy is supporting this Bill because of funding. I think the funding is significant and should be mentioned in connection with this. I might mention that virtually every State in the union has accepted this. I think that funding is important in this respect. Connecticut has no indigenous sources of energy. We drain as energy industry to the sun belt. I think we must address the energy problem in Connecticut and the further funding that is provided under the Energy Conservation Policy Act by the Federal Congress, and they are the ones that mandated this as one of the five areas that should be - that must be accomplished by State's funding, I think we shouldn't overlook that when we talk about right turn on red. There are significant energy savings but these are only a part of the total. We must improve our building codes and there are a number of other things toward energy savings. And that is why we have mentioned the possible loss of funding and it's not more than a possible loss since it is a mandatory area and the Federal law is very clear on that, as far as funding.

REP. HENDERSON: If the funding were not part of the question, would the Office of Policy & Management be ?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.

REP. HENDERSON: And it's a good public policy.

MR. McDONALD: That's a good public policy. Just as the State would have a --

REP. HENDERSON: it is not good public policy to differ from our sister states, most of whom have adopted this right turn on red light, so called rule for permissive. O.K. I'm really concerned that in the lat 1920's - California was the only State in the union that used red as a traffic control signal. The rest of the States used yellow as a stop signal. California was under great pressure to become one with the rest of the States. They stood firm and eventually red became the universal traffic stop signal in the United States. I see no reason why Connecticut could not become the State to use the Eastern rule which is permissable and to allow the other States to catch up with us.

MR. McDONALD: I do believe though as a small State with a lot of interstate traffic, we might find that our citizens are just as imperiled if we stand alone on the matter like that.

23  
gbs

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. McDONALD (Continued): There is that school of thought.

REP. SWEENEY: Representative Serrani.

REP. SERRANI: Representative Serrani, 144. First of all, has your Department been in touch with our Department of Transportation on mutual discussions of this issue?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, we have.

REP. SERRANI: And is there a time table that they have given you as the implantation of this concept? Did you consider it in your immediate time table for the establishment of the Bill?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, we would like to accelerate the time table. And utilize some of the Federal funds to tackle the matter of public education and the like. In fact, our preference on that is that, as drafted, the Bill would take effect on October 1, except that signs would not be posted until October 1. Under the Office of Policy & Management's recommendation, the Bill would take effect upon passage except that actually right turns would not be permitted until January 1, 1979. Thus permitting the Public Education such posting as might be required and so forth to be implemented in that interim of time.

REP. SERRANI: Now you - the Committee stated the position as of last year that any right hand turn on red light legislation would have to be preceded by strong, new pedestrian laws, with respect to pedestrian rights. And what is the OPM's position on the Pedestrian Bill that is before the legislature now.

MR. McDONALD: We support the Pedestrian Bill.

REP. SERRANI: O.K., and --

MR. McDONALD: We are happy also to see some of the funding utilized in the Public Education implementation.

REP. SERRANI: How would the strong pedestrian laws that you do favor, how would that be able to be squeezed in between the strict time table that you would like to establish with the enactment of the law? I mean is 6 months enough time to let the public know that they have certain rights in this connection?

MR. McDONALD: We feel it is. We feel that a well organized

24  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. McDONALD (Continued): campaign, amply funded could then accomplish that. In the worst of cases we could live with a longer experience. At least we feel that if you're going to bite on the bullet, then let's do it and let's have a meaningful and effective public educational campaign and I believe the feeling is that in any, in any education of the public, the concentrated efforts are better than stretched over a long period of time where the public is inclined to forget.

REP. SERRANI: Would you, would your office need people doing that publicity?

MR. McDONALD: We would certainly like to be a part of it.

REP. SERRANI: Who would you see being the initiator of that specific public education as to pedestrian rights and then right hand turn on red light?

MR. McDONALD: I don't know how far we've gone with our thinking on that quite frankly. We are commencing now an -- program. Some of you may have seen spots on television on a completely different aspect of energy conservation. We've got a team in, of people within the Office of Policy And Management who are effecting that. I think that could be used and must be used.

REP. SERRANI: I think this is an important question, because if we're going to act, if our policy is the same as last year, that we want pedestrians rights of way first to go into effect and then right hand turn on red light, if we're to enact the suggestions you're making as to moving this timetable closer to this time for the enactment of right hand turn on red light, we have to know before we make that decision that there is a program in place to educate the public on pedestrians rights and duties and if that's going to be your office or the Department of Transportation or the Department of Education, we have to know that there's a plan together to do that.

MR. McDONALD: I think it would obviously -- between the Energy Division and the Department of Transportation. We've been working with them for example on car pool and van pools very closely and so I don't see a problem there. I feel we could provide funding for that.

REP. SERRANI: The other point is this. We have to pinpoint dangers and congested intersections for the prohibitive

25  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. SERRANI (Continued): signs before we do this and I know for a fact in my town in Stamford, 110,000 people, this has not been pinpointed. We don't know the dangerous intersections where signs should be posted. That's also a time constraint and because we don't want to put into effect laws that are going to actually end up killing people as an experiment and this is an important factor. Just one other point and I just mentioned to the Chairman, that I think we should have the -- committee, the energy personnel from Boston who sent the letter to you stating the, the blackmail letter that you received on the funds, we should have these people here as we've had other people on auto emissions and other issues come...

MR. McDONALD: Yeah, I think they'd be very pleased to come down there...

REP. SERRANI: That's point blank how the situation is.

MR. McDONALD: The Department of Energy in Washington, Schlessinger's people and (INAUDIBLE)

REP. SWEENEY: Representative McKenna.

REP. McKENNA: Representative McKenna from the 85th District. My question, I have two questions really and one of them is how can a body or division suggest as they have in the -- program of installing -- lights, tripling the type of lights at intersections which runs into millions and millions of dollars in the State of Connecticut, then come along requesting and suggesting that you're going to be saving so much energy if a car makes a right hand turn on a red light? There's no way that I know of and I would be happy to go along with this bill, I've opposed it all the way so far, on the theory that a blind person cannot read the sign that says the cars can turn right on the red light and until such time that a blind person can read the sign or read the registration of the car that knocked him down, I would oppose any such savings on energy in this way.

MR. McDONALD: On the matter of the recommendations for additional traffic lights, I feel that is perhaps best addressed to the Department of Transportation. We haven't recommended or endorsed additional traffic lights or studied them. I share your concern for anybody who steps in front of an automobile, blind or otherwise. I think we've got a tremendous obligation as a state to educate our drivers to tighten our safety rules on vehicle inspection. Any number of measures.

26  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

- MR. McDONALD (Continued): I think there's no fail safe in any piece of legislature and I can only hope that since we in the Department of Energy are, the Division of Energy or Office of Policy And Management, are funded, we could use this in the most effective way to reach every blind person and warn them. I share your concern for health and safety but it's an uncertain moral and that may seem an inadequate answer but I would, I just don't feel I could say that...
- REP. MCKENNA: Would you say then that your department is increasing and maybe we're talking, maybe I didn't explain myself properly. Where you have had a traffic signal hanging in the middle of an intersection, you now have as many as eight walksidcs, two on each corner, plus you have increased the number of traffic lights to two for each lane, east and west, north and south, where at that time we were still in an energy crunch and this department has not suggested to, if we will blame it onto the Transportation Department, that this was wasting quadtriple the number of killowatt hours you were going to be using at any given intersection where a traffic design had been changed. --- within two years and now we're going back to eliminating just one or putting up just the signs, stating that you can make a right turn on a red light or reverse that and say, cannot make a right turn on a red light at the intersection.
- REP. SWEENEY: Yes, Representative Wilber. Oh I'm sorry. Go ahead. Respond to that question.
- MR. McDONALD: Well I was going to point out that the right turn on red is not, the driver has the full obligation to do what he would do in any case. He's not to run down the pedestrians because he's allowed to make a right turn on red. As to the number of lights, I feel, I just feel that must be the Department of Transportation and perhaps if they have ----, they could deal with that aspect--they have instituted the number they have or...
- REP. WILBER: Thank you. I'm particularly concerned about your timetable too and I see that you have a copy of that.
- Belt #6: Would you be good enough to leave it with the Committee so we can understand what you have in mind. My first question is are you aware that the Department of Transportation and I hope that I have my figure right, it was indicated that 45% of the intersections in the state would probably not be satisfactory for a right turn on red and we're talking about almost 50% ---so that either rule really probably would involve the same amount of timing. We're not really talking

27  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. WILBER (Continued): about for example, much saving in timing. Also are you aware that the Department of Transportation indicates that it costs \$20,000 and I suppose therefore considerable time in taking down its present signs, that they have not in the past three years, I think it's three years since we have had this law, given particular energy to it and in fact I believe there are only 150 signs posted and my question is do you think the Department of Transportation is going to be particularly cooperative in this matter? Do you think really considering 45% would not be worth right turn on red, that we're really going to get very much out of the change in this law and we're really going to save anything and the Department of Transportation, do you believe the Department of Transportation possibly, could possibly keep up with your timetable?

MR. McDONALD: I think the 45% to 50% is perhaps an extremely excessive estimate. As far as the Department of Transportation supporting it, I believe Commissioner Schrugue has already testified or had one of his people testify in support of it. That's shortly after the testimony a few weeks ago. Sister Claire Markham phoned Commissioner Schrugue and felt they were fully supportive of it, so on that aspect working with them and so forth, I see no problem. I think perhaps once this thing is accepted, once the public education campaign is started in earnest that the estimates of the 45% or something, you're going to find that it isn't necessary to post that many. We're very use to stop streets in Connecticut and the area where our office is, is made up of a Puerto Rican community plus lawyers offices, Grant Street, Rust Street where my state office is, and I rarely see a violation there of the stop street. Pedestrians are crossing, state employees on their way to work, lawyers, back and forth. We're really, the invention is no more than that.

REP. WILBER: Well I just want to comment that I think that the lack of political reality is because the Department of Transportation may testify, but in fact there has been a reluctance on the part of the Department of Transportation to implement the present program and what you're trying to tell us is that they just jump with enthusiasm into a new program. I don't believe for a minute and I also know that the Department of Transportation takes a very long time in surveying streets and when you talk about six months, they're going to have to hire what I feel, professional help to do anything in six months. I mean that is just not the way the Department of Transportation functions and we'll have a law and it'll go into passage and we're going to be in terrible

28  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. WILBER (Continued): hot water, if your timetable holds up.

REP. HENDERSON: Representative Rosso.

REP. ROSSO: Representative Rosso of the 30th. In my own explanation, right now we have a permissive law which permits right turns on red where posted. Under this proposal, we would then tear up those signs, replace them with signs on corners which will not allow right turn on red, is that correct.

MR. McDONALD: That's right. There are very few signs throughout the state that allow the permissive right turn on red. We're not really saving much energy by having the law as it's now written.

REP. ROSSO: Well that's my question. Why? What's the difference?

MR. McDONALD: I think the difference is that no real effort has been made to survey that. There's no incentive for the towns. They have their other problems and it just isn't a priority for them.

REP. ROSSO: And under your plan, would the towns be surveyed as to what intersections would be excluded?

MR. McDONALD: Yes they would be.

REP. ROSSO: And do you anticipate the same kind of cooperation?

MR. McDONALD: Well I think certainly it is allowed everywhere that isn't posted, yes. And I think towns would be much more, much quicker to respond if they felt there was a hazard to their pedestrians and so forth at given intersections. Absolutely.

REP. ROSSO: Okay. Also, you stated that as our policy on the Committee here to help with this, the Pedestrian Rights Law, conversing then that if we don't pass the Pedestrian Rights Law, do you think that we shouldn't pass this law?

MR. McDONALD: No I don't because I think the right turn on red law, we intend public education in it. Part of which is your, in your Pedestrians Rights Law and if the Pedestrians Rights Law does not go ahead, we would still want to have the public education, the posting, the surveying of those intersections that require laws and all that, require signs and so forth to go forward and that's contemplated. So I don't feel the two are, they're not incompatible, but

29  
gcb

## TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. McDONALD (Continued): they're not absolutely ---.

REP. HENDERSON: Representative Reynolds.

REP. REYNOLDS: I am Representative Reynolds, 116th. I have also a question as Representative Wilber of the timetable and it's not that this Committee is against red turns, right turns on red lights and what you've just said a minute ago, if you did a nationwide study you'll find that Connecticut has absolutely atrocious pedestrians and for your energy savings, how many people do you want killed the way we drive now. I will admit that Massachusetts has worst laws, but if you travel around this country you will find that there are not many other states that are as bad as Connecticut. If you go to the midwest, you will find that where streets and all are laid out on perpendicular and all, people drive a lot differently than they drive around here and it's the feeling of this Committee, at least myself and my subcommittee, that we're not going to rush into right turns on red to get the Pedestrian Law and then end up with two or three or more deaths to save energy. Unless, it's my belief, unless we educate the people through the Pedestrian Law we have no need for right turns on red lights.

REP. HENDERSON: Sir I'm Representative Henderson from the 112th and I represent a suburban and rural community. We have relatively few traffic control lights in my area. The reason we do have those few is because of poor sight lines in which stop signs will not work because of no way of controlling the traffic otherwise. The Committee would have to sign every one of those intersections, few though they might be because of these --sight lines even though, you know, we would make it permissive, a person could not pull out into traffic, not knowing what is coming up the hill and what they could see. Wouldn't it be a better policy if we talked about the stop signs and how they work so well in the city, to have a policy where you could have a permissive rule in an incorporated area and then an unpermissive rule in the unincorporated area. Wouldn't that make a lot more sense than just following the federal dictate to get federal monies? Why couldn't we have something in that nature? Would that meet the federal requirements?

MR. McDONALD: I don't think it would meet the federal requirements and I think it would make a tremendous patchwork quilt out of Connecticut. I think if there is any hope that Connecticut drivers can be more disciplined, can be better trained, vehicles made safer and so forth, we've got to do

30  
gcb

## TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. McDONALD (Continued): the state laws.

REP. HENDERSON: I raised that as a point because what may work in an incorporated area with good sight lines, may not work in a rural area. So if you would say one rule would have to apply to all, good, bad or indifferent, the same as if we had several rules that might not be good policy either.

MR. McDONALD: I see your appeal from the point of view of your particular area. I just feel that this is linked statewide and we would have multiple problems if we tried to be selective throughout the state.

REP. TULISANO: Representative Tulisano of the 29th. I may have missed some of the testimony earlier, so forgive me but I have one, my first question is does anybody from our agency go to Washington to argue with them to decipher what the regulations are? I mean obviously I know the United States government has ---with the rest of the states,--- about the original thirteen they created. We are a bit different. They were, you know ---. (INAUDIBLE) as a matter of fact --- in a system which was designed by the federal government. Our areas of the state were designed by --- for a number of reasons. (INAUDIBLE) And I have a funny feeling about this program, about the other program that they do not give enough leadway in their regulations and do --- that you know, you're right -- Maybe there are two or three that are not right where they ought to give that --.

MR. McDONALD: Yes sir we had an uneasy relationship with the old federal energy administration and --with the Department of Energy. The fact that Sister Claire, Under Secretary for Energy is in Washington today, is an indication of our endeavors to get the federal people to do things in our light. I believe the purpose of her, and I won't be long about this, the purpose of her visit today is that there is a trend toward implementing solar energy funding only to the sunbelt states. Well they already don't have an energy problem and Sister Claire Markham feels that we should be able to get solar funding here. So she's in Washington for that purpose today. We're constantly trying to be vigilant and look out for Connecticut's interests, because our energy situation is so different than the coal states or the oil and gas states, the hydro states in the far West, that yes we are watching.

REP. TULISANO: My second question is of the nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars we expect to be cut off with, are

31  
gcb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. TULISANO (Continued): there any other programs in which that threat may also be imposed in, in your department?

MR. McDONALD: The implication in the letter that its been suggested that in a subsequent hearing that we ask the Department of Energy to come down from Region One Boston or even someone from Washington to come. The implication in the letter was that yes, other funding could be, could be effected and some of that funding is going into weatherization, in something for the aged and I don't think that it will come to that. We had a quick legal opinion that they couldn't do it.

REP. TULISANO: ---the question. The nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars. Is that in reference only to the right turn on red law...

MR. McDONALD: Oh no.

REP. TULISANO: Or are there a number of other programs, any kind you wish, the federal government, the bureaucracy which -- controls the people outside of New England, can turn around and say we're going to -- at this level, at this one, or this level and thereby abolish our rights in determining what we think is good for the people of the State of Connecticut.

MR. McDONALD: No.

32  
gcb

## TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

: This money comes under a comprehensive grant that Belt #7 calls for the states that submitted comprehensive plans to reduce their energy consumption by 5% by 1980. In the, to get that funding, and this is really the Governor's plan but apparently all 50 states put in plans, over five mandatory areas, one of which is right turn on red. The others were areas you must have energy standards in your State Building Codes. We're addressing that. We don't have at the moment. You could build a house out of ---, let the energy go out, but we will have a --- timetable. There were other mandatory areas. But over and above those five mandatory areas of which right turn on red was one, there are any number of other funded programs---

: What you're saying is that for some reason, in other words a Building Department Code,---they promulgate a regulation after a hearing. One of the states doesn't like that particular regulation, you lose the money there. Or two, if the Regulations Review Committee of the General Assembly doesn't like the regulation and rejects it, it's conceivable ---- (INAUDIBLE)

: Yes, but of the five mandatory areas, others were already doing a statewide car pool and van pool program being conducted by DOT working with us and the Building Codes as far as I know are going to go, are going to go through without any problem.

REP. HENDERSON: One last question from any other speaker. Yes.

REP. SERRANI: You mentioned the -- is officially in favor of the Pedestrian Rights Bill. Is that correct? Has --- communicated with the Governor on this point?

MR. McDONALD: That I do not know. (INAUDIBLE)

REP. SERRANI: I suggest that really and I think and I don't want to speak for the Committee, but I think you understood here this morning by the kinds of questions that were asked, the kinds of fears that are on this Committee that the -- is HB5044 in the Governor's corner. The Governor vetoed the Pedestrians Rights Bill last year and without that Pedestrians Rights Bill, there will not be a right hand turn on red light bill as far as I can see from this Committee and to -- the Governor is going to support the Pedestrians Rights and Duties Bill by not vetoing it again, I think then that that point has to be made to us before this Committee's deadline is finished.

36  
gbs

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. SWEENEY: Mr. Mike Klein, I believe, from the AAA.  
Belt  
#8

MIKE KLEIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Transportation Committee. My name is Mike Klein and I represent the Triple-A, which is based in West Hartford. We are here today to support the proposed Bill No. 5045, which is an act authorizing right turns on red. While we do, indeed, at this point, have right turn on red legislation, few motorists have seen evidence of it because of the low number of signs that are posted, so that we're back again this year after to urge you to pass the Generally Permissive legislation on right. We should, in fact, that are on that highway,

Passage of the Generally Permissive legislation will not only alleviate a certain percentage of polluting emissions, but will save hundred of thousands of gallons of gas now being expended while vehicles are standing still. information from the Connecticut and from the National Safety Council, I am told that there are 3500 signalized intersections throughout Connecticut, which would be eligible for General Permissive legislation on red. The National Safety Council states that 600 gallons of gasoline per intersection per annum is saved by this legislation. And if you add up the figures, it would amount to 2,100,000 gallons of fuel that would be saved for a year. This fuel savings represents 31,500,000 miles of travel that state residents could use at no extra cost in fuel or polluting emittants.

While we do urge passage of Bill 5045, we feel that the Bill certainly must be 5044 legislation and strong public information campaign.

REP. SWEENEY: Thank you. J. J. Casey.

JOHN J. CASEY: Gentlemen, members of the Committee. My name is John J. Casey, 835 Road, in Orange, and I'm here on behalf of the AAA, endorse Bill 5045 and also reconsider the accompanying measure, 5044, Representative Serrani's bill, and fact we have in the mail today, obviously, the publication which carries the interpretation of this Bill in the form of a guest editorial.

REP. SWEENEY: Any questions?

46  
gan

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

JOSEPH BOBER (Continued): think that is necessary. You have got to take the facts and then you have to update them. And I wish the committee would give this their serious attention. Thank you.

REP. HENDERSON: Any questions of Mr. Bober?

REP. SERRANI: Some clarification that the bill support 283 --

JOSEPH BOBER: you have heard from the people from New York of a bridge. it's economically feasible and it would possibly for people to use it without from this point for eight years it would waste my time. I can drive around and make a U turn, but it took an hour for the ferry at that time to go 13 miles. By the time they line up, get on and you line up to get off, you got an hour and a half to two hours. But it's very economically feasible. The committee will determine that. The commission is going to study it. I doubt that a tunnel would be feasible, because affect the sound, the appearance somewhere along the line. Five years ago we talked about Originally the proposal that came to this General Assembly which proposed by the New England was a bridge to Montauk Point to Rhode Island and it doesn't show that and a road there and a question of the feasibility some doubt it generates traffic and I don't think it would be good I think it would be better New Haven because then you have ready access by super highways Any further questions? Thank you.

REP. HENDERSON: John Cavallero.

HB5045

JOHN CAVALLERO: Mr. Chairman, my name is John Cavallero, director of traffic in the City of New Haven before that I was deputy commissioner in 1975 76 I was chairman of the group called urban traffic most of the major cities of the United States. In 1977 I was president of the counsellor. The reason testimony introduced on the hearing of February 23rd, the right turn on red. from the policy the State of Connecticut right turn on red what we call are not permissible rule not what you call Connecticut rule but it may be one of the state so called this committee this committee does not have any testimony institution of the said I think will be safer for

JOHN CAVALLERO (Continued): motorists and pedestrians where the so called rule. I don't see how anyone could make this statement and All this points to the fact that a right turn on red results in more accidents and I would like to leave you an except from a study prepared by Dr. who prepared the original report to the United States House of Representatives Public Works Committee on the national implementation of right turn on red. And this report would be presented to the State Research Board in January 1977. HB5045

Actually I think the first page and the results of the accident, this is from the location that we had the study, it appeared that the recurrence of accidents related to right turn on red is very On the bottom of that paragraph, we have the sentence the general conclusion drawn from the analysis is that right turn on red is not significantly safety to signal traffic operations. to prevent traffic accidents here for the state of Colorado. I remember that would include not only the urban centers but the entire state highway systems in that state, to my knowledge, essentially not entirely intensified as a result the State of Connecticut. And this is a state that has passed the right turn law in 1970 and the accident record is that the accident study is present the years 1970 and 1975. This shows approximately a 1% accident rate of accidents that happened in the state. All the state accidents right turn on red. So it is not at this point broken down for the urban centers.

Later on in his report it deals with the city of Dallas. HB5045  
Table four for Dallas, Texas, for 1972 to 1974.  
This is before and after pedestrian accidents in comparison for Dallas. In other words, it is the area solely for pedestrian accidents. For the one year before the implementation of right turn on red there were 48 accidents for the year after the implementation of right turn on red there was 55 accidents, therefore there was an increase of seven accidents or 14.6 increase of accidents. Second category is we have the pedestrian accidents at inter-sections. The year before there were 16, the year after right turn on red was 18, It seems to me that those figures do not report Some of the things that have been said about right turn on red are motorists

MR. CAVALLERO (Continued): That study found that on an 80% implementation In other words, it's 80% of all the intersections in the State of Virginia were to have right turn on red it would be an ample saving of approximately 3 million gallons of gasoline annually.

If you first of all look at the motor vehicle registration for the State of Virginia that comes to about one gallon per vehicle per year which does not seem to be a significant saving fuel savings by any reasonable measure.

However, 80% implementation level In the City of New Haven two weeks ago the Board of Police Commissioners of the City in a meeting at the Traffic Authority discussed in great detail the right turn on red legislation being proposed in the State of Connecticut, asking for a full report on that situation and for my advice as the Chief Technician to the Traffic Authority. They concluded at the completion of that discussion that I should convey to your Committee that New Haven Board of Police Commissioners did not support implementation of the permissive rule. In other words, they would of the current Connecticut rule because they feel it is far more safe, safer because, as has been explained to you, under Connecticut rule you make the right turn only where the sign says you may. If the sign is missing, and signs are missing all the time -- people take them into the dormitory, if you're a college town they end up in a dormitory room, or they get knocked down in an accident. But if that sign is missing, then you have introduced a hazard because, say, a right turn on red is not permitted at the intersection as is the case with the permissive rule, then you'd have a problem there for the right turn, and the missing sign has now introduced a hazard.

That's what I was saying about New Haven. We have early studies of all our signalized intersections. We have 1,500 intersections in the city and 250 of these are equipped with traffic signals. We have narrowed it down to an actual possibility of 47 intersections suited to meet the right turn on red criteria. That is far less than an 80% implementation. And the criteria I referred to are those criteria established by the State Traffic Commission which are necessary in order to have right turn on red without injuring or causing a hazard to people. My conclusion from our studies is that the implementation levels for a city in Connecticut, New Haven or Stamford or Hartford or Bridgeport, is in the order of approximately 20 to 25%.

49  
gar

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. CAVALLERO (Continued): So while I don't feel my principal concern with right turn on red is not one of the thoughts, I really have not heard that expressed by other Traffic Engineers in Connecticut. I think I know every one of them on a first-name basis. It states nowhere in the history of our profession have we ever been required to do something that we thought wasn't safe. I think that that's something that the Committee might ponder.

As you can see from this folder I have been following right turn on red as a technician for several years. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

REP. SERRANI: You mentioned you talked to engineers throughout the State of Connecticut safety, on the 23rd of January Mr. Hennessey gave testimony before the Past Presidents of the International Transportation Engineers. In that testimony he stated that the Past Presidents of the International Transportation Engineers were against right turn on red light. Would you tell me at which meeting -- first of all, how many past presidents of the ITE there are.

MR. CAVALLERO: There are probably 24.

REP. SERRANI: And how many members of the ITE past presidents signed that statement?

MR. CAVALLERO: At the meeting we adopted that statement there were nine present and they unanimously adopted the statement. Subsequent to the adoption of the statement and after Mr. McGrath testified at your hearing by mail total almost a majority of the total of the number of past presidents have indicated their support to that function.

REP. SERRANI: You're saying that there were past presidents who disagreed with that position?

MR. CAVALLERO: There's one who feels that -- does not agree with the statement.

REP. SERRANI: Just for correction sake, I think there was a misconception at that meeting, it may have been a misconception on the part of the Committee that the New England Division of ITE was against the bill.

MR. CAVALLERO: No they have not taken a position.

REP. SERRANI: And have they discussed this issue, or have you

50  
gar

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. SERRANI (Continued): with other members of the ITE? I received many calls from people in ICE who were upset with that statement.

MR. CAVALLERO: Well, I'd be rather surprised because I mentioned to the others present at the New England Section in 1977. Right turn on red has been the discussion at many meetings, has never been brought into the New England Section during 1977, never brought to partly because our National Institute has the prerogative to adopt policy and they're not always in agreement with the policy this will take, but we are saying to take part on a national policy position of our national group. Most discussions that have happened at the New England Section in 1977 there was widespread concern about safety in right turn on red group.

REP. SERRANI: I don't doubt that. I'm just saying that I think to this Committee it's important to know --

MR. CAVALLERO: There are no position taken by the New England --

REP. SERRANI: It's important for us to know what the other engineers and State feel on this issue, in addition to the other past presidents of the organization. I just want to make sure there's no misconception on the part of this Committee to understand your entire past president organization, what position you're taking today, what the other members of the ICE in the New England Chapter support this --

MR. CAVALLERO: No, the testimony by Mr. McGrath, typically

REP. SERRANI: Of the nine past presidents who signed the letter. At that time I don't think he mentioned that there were other presidents who accepted that position. It wasn't a meeting of the past presidents, it was a meeting of nine past presidents in the organization.

MR. CAVALLERO: If I may add, one other point that has been made for the or permissive rules is uniformity and you have some thoughts earlier when someone comes to the Governor's office of jeopardizing programs because of the desire of the federal government to have to inform you. That's a very strange argument to use because of all the States, which are now 49 or 48, I don't know where Massachusetts is today, have the rule.

51  
gar

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. CAVALLERO (Continued): There's at least 18 varieties of right turn on red legislation. In other words, stops at the intersection, what his obligations are after he makes a stop. That's all uniformly

REP. SERRANI: There's one other question. You're from New Haven and New Haven has done a study on this, saying where it should be prohibited. Right now in New Haven where are signs posted allowing right-hand turn on red light under existing laws, how many signs are posted?

MR. CAVALLERO: We have about 15 intersections where we have allowed right turn on red for several years by virtue of traffic signals, indications or channelization, raised islands that were built at intersections. We have either five or six locations under the 1976 State Statute. That is it allows right turn on red right turn on red

I have with me, as a matter of fact, a study of the motorists observance at one of those intersections --

REP. SERRANI: Could you summarize for us what the conditions of those intersections have been in New Haven since they've been installed. Has there been an increase in accidents, pedestrian accidents at those intersections?

MR. CAVALLERO: I do not have the accidents with me. I do have the observance study, of motorists approaching the signal and only related to those motorists that were approaching the red indication. Of 57 vehicles in this one hour period that approached the red light at Canalgot Road in on the edge of our downtown area by the harbor, 26 of that total stopped, made the stop for the red light, 58%, an extremely high violation. Now, I'm concerned about that.

REP. SERRANI: (INAUDIBLE)

Any other questions?

SB263

MR. CAVALLERO: It's an important bridge. It's over U.S. 1 Belt as a matter of fact. We call it Fords Avenue, but the #12 State maintains . And even though the Connecticut Turnpike was built and is now carrying upwards of 60,000 vehicles a day through that area, Fords Avenue or Route 1 remains as a major city artery. It's currently being operated in a one-way alternating fashion because of

52  
gar

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

MR. CAVALLERO (Continued): the repairs. Of more concern was the expeditious repair and restoration of that bridge and its ability to support the traffic including the train traffic that is essential to that area which includes major oil terminal facilities, major power plants and other industrial facilities. We're more concerned with that speedy completion than we are with the unfortunate series of accident that have happened over the past several years to the bridge. We think that the concern should be investigating that bridge. We have the possibility of a calamitous traffic snarl if there is some sort of problem on the Connecticut Turnpike Bridge over the River. Then the alternative is only a one lane alternating roadway. The whole traffic corridor on the shore route to go to New York would be disrupted. HB5045

REP. HENDERSON: Representative Murphy.

REP. MURPHY: Working on that survey, you had to put an hour survey on that right turn on red?

MR. CAVALLERO: It was more than an hour

REP. MURPHY: How many -- you said 23 stopped -- did the Police Department give any tickets out at the right turn?

MR. CAVALLERO: This survey was done by my staff in unmarked cars.

REP. MURPHY: You were working under the Police Department in New Haven.

MR. CAVALLERO: I don't work in the Police Department. I'm head SB263 of the Traffic Department in New Haven.

REP. SERRANI: Just going back to John's question, you're point was that very few people stopped, they just slowed down and ran. On the Bridge and traffic in your city, have you -- what is the problem you have had with the State in getting action on that? What has been your reaction from the State? Is it cost strictly, redesign?

MR. CAVALLERO: Well, I recall earlier after the first or second river traffic accident there was a question raised about insurance and I thought that it was a little bit odd that we should be concerned about who was going to pay for the damage. If you've got no private party to pay for it, the bridge has to be restored. It's a State local facility.

57  
gbs

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

JAMES CURRAN: My name's James Curran, I'm an attorney in  
Belt Danbury, here representing, speaking Bill No. 73  
#13 Danbury. I represent  
traffic center

The location three quarter miles west of  
area in Danbury  
my clients, the owners,  
and anyone else in the

My clients paid me to come here  
right now and we would like to propose that, as soon as  
possible, use appropriation funding for a study  
any longer, basically due to the safety  
because of the

Thank you.

REP. HENDERSON: are you registered as a  
there?

JAMES CURRAN: No, I'm not. I expect for that

REP. HENDERSON: But you are clients, I believe you  
said clients.

JAMES CURRAN: Inaudible.

REP. HENDERSON: Frank Strano.

FRANK STRANO: Thank you, Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of  
the Committee. My name is Frank Strano and I live in  
Manchester, Connecticut. I'm appearing here this morning  
on behalf of the Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce.  
The Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the adoption of  
legislation permitting the right turn on red unless a sign  
is posted preventing it, House Bill 5045. The Chamber  
supports this legislation for several reasons. The most  
important is that it saves energy and provides for a  
cleaner, healthier atmosphere for our citizens. Certainly  
there is no question that both of these concerns are major  
issues for all of us today. One being in short supply; the  
other being already polluted.

It has been estimated that the energy savings with this  
legislation adopted would amount to millions of gallons of  
gasoline per year. As a direct result, quality of air and  
the reduction of pollut-on is assured. Simply stated, the  
Chamber of Commerce - the Greater Hartford Chamber of  
Commerce feels that House Bill 5045 is the most significant

FRANK STRANO (Continued): single piece of legislation affecting energy conservation in the quality of air that has been seriously considered in Connecticut in the last ten years.

The Chamber is also aware of the concerns of some of its citizens regarding the proposed legislation. The most negative aspect of permitting the right turn on red movement is the safety hazard it may present to motorists and pedestrians. Accident studies in four cities, Dallas, Denver, Chicago and Los Angeles, and in two states, Colorado and Virginia, have been analyzed and it was found that right turn on red accidents represent an insignificant percentage of all signalized intersection accidents. For the generally permissive rule, right turn on red accidents were found to be 0.61 percent of all signalized intersection accidents, slightly more than one-half of one percent. It was also determined in at least two accident studies that the right turn on red accident rate - the number of right turn on red accidents divided by the right turn on red volume - was less than that of right turn on green accident rate.

In Dallas and in Denver, studies showed and it was observed that right turn on red did not result in any pedestrian accidents for the one year study period. One other general result regarding right turn on red accidents is that they tend to be less severe and result in fewer injuries than the average intersection accident. The results of the accident analysis, support the claim that accidents resulting from right turn on red are insignificant compared to all signalized intersection accidents and therefore would be supportive of a generally permissive rule.

As of July 1, 19-7, 48 States and Puerto Rico have adopted legislation for the permissive right turn on red rule. Only the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts have not. It is time that Connecticut move into the 20th Century on this issue. The Chamber is also in full support of the accompanying legislation regarding the pedestrian rights Bill 5044. Any questions from the panel?

I would like to say that my testimony directly conflicts with the testimony that this Committee has heard to my coming up here. The testimony that I'm submitting is culled from basically the same report that such testimony supporting on the same aspects of right turn on red.

REP. HENDERSON: (Inaudible)

FRANK STRANO: Fine, I would like to just read one paragraph

59  
gbs

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

FRANK STRANO (Continued): from the Executive summary, submitted by H. W. for a study that was done for the Federal Highways Administration, February '74 to May '76. And it states: The results of the various studies supporting the adoption of the generally permissive right turn on red rule, by all states, significant benefits in the form of reduction and delay, fuel consumption and all realize without . Thank you.

REP. HENDERSON: Do you have any feelings as to why traffic engineers together as a group against the right turn on red? To put it another way, do you feel that the fear of complication?

FRANK STRANO: I don't think that. I think that concerns other than safety general propagation

REP. HENDERSON: Are there any other members of the public who would like to on the Bills we are considering here SB264 today? Mr. Avo Ora.

AVO ORA: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I'm pleased to be back again. My name is Avo Ora, I'm for Consultant Design for the Department of Transportation and I'm representing that department in order to express our opinion regarding the commuting did before. We strongly support a center of 22 railroad track. However, we are of the opinion that in some instances provided. Consideration should be given to factors. First, we feel that there are instances where a 22 is not necessary for . Second, the impact of providing 22 would be unreasonable to in some instances. Third, clearances on this track, especially area, are far more than the minimum standard clearance . I intend to demonstrate all of these points. trailer truck or car identified with the car

car are 18 feet and are

The current railroad legislation has established various requirements for top of the car and bottom of the truck . For these reasons, 25,000 volts of electric along the north corridor, natural requirement for an electrified operation most extreme type requirement

68  
gnb

TRANSPORTATION

March 1, 1978

REP. HENDERSON: Could you leave a copy of that testimony. (INAUDIBLE)  
Nelson Douglas.

MR. DOUGLAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I am not going to take up much of your time. I am here speaking for the Connecticut Safety Commission and we are of course in favor of 5044 and 5045 and we were the originators of both these bills. I -- there are a couple of points that I think I should point to you. On the Pedestrian Safety Bill -- approximately 75 percent of all pedestrian accidents occur  
This Bill, Pedestrian Safety is strictly for non-signalized intersections and between intersections. It seems to be some feeling in the Committee that right on red and the Pedestrian Rights & Safety have to go together. This is not so because right turn on red signal only at signalized intersections and Pedestrian Rights & Safety is -- actually has nothing to do directly with signalized intersections.

We are in favor of right turn on red as we have been all along. I do feel that we are in a position now to -- where it is almost mandatory that we -- from a state standpoint -- that we should pass this general right on red. You can talk to fifty different people as far as right turn on red and you can get 25 one way or the other. This is a different professional, 25 one way or the other, whether they think it is good or bad. From a state/city standpoint we know of no -- all the data we have seen, it isn't a safety ability factor. But we feel right now, through the situation we have with 48 states possibly 49 after this legislature voting Massachusetts will pass this general -- if you have 49 states people coming from those 49 states into Connecticut making right turns all over the place, the Connecticut with the group, that it is mandatory that you pass this law. If you do not, if you choose to not pass this I would even suggest that maybe the Committee should consider repealing the sign law so that at least Connecticut would have the -- would become known as they don't have any right turn on red at all.  
safety standpoint . (INAUDIBLE)

Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON: Gentlemen you have been most patient. No we have one more speaker. John Bentley.

MR. BENTLEY: I am with the State Department of Transportation, the Deputy Commissioner I think is on next so I will be very brief. On Senate Bill 73, Route 6 and 37 in Danbury we support the intent of this bill but we don't feel it is really needed in sections of two sections of Route 6 in Danbury, one near the New York line and one near the first interchange is to be widened in connection with the workmen who are doing the

S-137

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1978  
SPEC. SESS.  
JUNE

VOL. 21  
PART 8  
2865-3320

Monday, May 1, 1978

8.

roc

with it?

THE CLERK:

lco 4512.

SENATOR OWENS:

May that matter be P.T'd please.

THE PRESIDENT:

Do you want this matter to be P.T'd, Senator DePiano?

SENATOR DEPIANO:

I have no objection to it.

THE PRESIDENT:

The matter will be passed temporarily, hearing no objection.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page seven of the Calendar, top item on the page, Cal. 843, Fies 669 and 748. Favorable report of the joint standing Committee on Appropriations. Substitute for House Bill 5045. AN ACT AUTHORIZING RIGHT TURNS ON RED TRAFFIC LIGHTS, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS: (22nd)

If I may at this time, I would move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE PRESIDENT:

Will you remark?

Monday, May 1, 1978

9.

SENATOR OWENS:

roc

Yes, Mr. President. This is a bill that has had a long time in coming. It's a bill that is very important. As you know, the State of Connecticut will be the forty-ninth state or the forty-eighth state to adopt this type of legislation; and in fact authorizes right turn on red traffic lights. The bill would authorize a motor vehicle to make a right turn on a steady red traffic signal after stopping and yielding the right of way to pedestrians lawfully in an adjacent crosswalk; and all other traffic lawfully using the intersection. In effect, the existing law, as it is now, Mr. President, is that those municipalities who have designated authority to make a right turn on red have had the intersections posted. On the effective date of the passage of this bill, it will be ascertained and the communities in the event they do not want, ah, the municipal authority does not want an automobile to make a right turn on red, they, in fact, will be required to post same. Also the State of Connecticut, acting by the Department of Transportation through the commissioner of transportation, would so mark the intersections as well when they feel, after a study has been made, that a right turn on red would not be appropriate. As I said, this bill has been a long time in coming. Last year it passed; however, there was insufficient appropriation at that time. Since that time, we have found out that there are financial federal appropriations for this and most of the financial expense will, in fact, be borne by the government. I would

Monday, May 1, 1978

10.

roc

also point out the part of the bill also deals with the pedestrian right of way and pedestrian safety. That was a separate bill last year that was vetoed by the Governor and it has been incorporated this time in this particular bill and the Governor quite appropriately vetoed the bill last year because application of the doctrine of negligent per se would be prohibited. Last time, if the bill had been signed and the bill passed and it had not been vetoed, many of the standards that we set forth in the bill requiring pedestrian safety and putting obligations on the pedestrian would militate against them in the event there was a personal injury action brought on their behalf and these various regulations or laws with respect to pedestrian safety could have been set forth in defense. We have added that civil actions arising from the new requirements, the application of doctrine of negligence per se would be prohibited. As I said, it seems to me that this is a fair solution. And I should be very candid with the circle that there was some objection by the blind and the handicapped that they thought we were moving too far too fast and they thought that there was a general disregard for the rights of the pedestrian in the State of Connecticut and that Connecticut has a bad reputation with respect to pedestrians' safety rights. So that is why we have incorporated the rights of the pedestrian in the right turn on red bill and I think that it will satisfy everyone in some degree. Obviously, I can't tell the circle enough the convenience that this will cause the drivers in the state particularly those

Monday, May 1, 1978

11.

roc

that are on lonely roads in the night and so forth. They don't have to wait two, three or four minutes for a light to change. This factor is a very important factor. There is also a serious energy factor and it will be a great saving along that line. Senator Con O'Leary who has had a great deal of interest in this bill and also Senator Schneller who has shown evidence and a lot of people in this circle knew that this was the type of bill that its time was coming. I would defer to Senator O'Leary if he would want to discuss various aspects of the bill particularly that involving energy saving.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY: (7th)

Mr. President, thank you. I rise to support the bill. I would like to thank Senator Owens of the Transportation Committee for all the work that he and his committee have done on this bill and also Senator Houley for the appropriations Committee. In addition to being a great convenience for the people of the State of Connecticut and I also believe a good and great additional safety factor by making our state consistent with our neighboring states with respect to our traffic laws, this bill should also have an energy impact on the State of Connecticut. Our state government alone spends twenty-seven million dollars annually in energy costs for the State of Connecticut. This bill will save an estimated approximately one point two million gallons of gasoline alone. I think that's

Monday, May 1, 1978

12.

roc

a significant saving for our state. In addition, it protects nearly one million dollars a year which we receive from the federal government for our Office of Policy and Management. The energy division of that office has been the recipient of that approximately one million dollars per year, that money funds personnel who are attempting to lead our state along the path of conservation, difficult as that may be. I think that this bill in addition to being a monetary boon for that department is a moral boon as well and it will help psychologically that department and I think our entire state along the much-needed path of energy conservation.

SENATOR MORANO: (36th)

Mr. President, fellow senators, I think this legislation is long overdue. It has been before the lower chamber, to my knowledge, four or five terms, ah, four or five times in the many terms I was there. It spells out the rights of pedestrians and this is the key to the whole bill. I think it has been the most objectionable part of this legislation in the past and I think the Transportation Committee should be commended in spelling out the pedestrian's right of way. The energy factor is most important and I would urge everyone in the chamber to support this bill.

THE PRESIDENT:

Thank you. Senator Cutillo.

SENATOR CUTILLO: (15th)

Mr. President, members of the circle, this bill, and I

2877

Monday, May 1, 1978

13.

roc

concur with Senator Morano, is a living example of the incongruity of our legislative process. While we are in a mad rush to pass bad legislation, good legislation like this takes four and five years. I am very happy to see it on our Calendar and it should have been here a long time ago.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Ballen.

SENATOR BALLEEN: (28th)

Thank you, Mr. President, I would just like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers and I rise in support of the bill. I think, very briefly, Mr. President, it will serve three main purposes. One, it will certainly ease traffic congestion and the flow of traffic will be made a lot more easy; two, it will eliminate the automobiles from burning gas unneedlessly, waiting at red lights and thereby save necessary fuel and very needed energy; and three, it should do a lot in cutting down air pollution. So for those very three good reasons, I strongly would support this bill.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Schneller.

THE PRESIDENT IN THE CHAIR

SENATOR SCHNELLER: (20th)

Mr. President, I rise to briefly add my words to those who preceded me. I have been interested in this legislation for anumber of years and I am very pleased to see it has

Monday, May 1, 1978

14.

roc

finally arrived at the point where we are going to allow right turns on red. I am particularly interested in it as an energy saver and as a means of eliminating pollution; and I think it will go a long way to accomplish both of those very badly needed areas and I commend the Transportation Committee and Regulated Activities Committee for their support on this bill.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON: (6th)

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, would like to rise in support of this legislation and commend those who have worked so hard to bring it to us in such a very responsible form. Having lived in a state where this legislation was law for years, I feel that those who worry about the possible endangerment of the handicapped and blind will find that it does not present such problems and having returned just this weekend from a state where this law is in force, I feel even more strongly that it is important that the states are consistent in their approach to this problem because it is confusing to move from state to state where this law is different, and I think people coming into Connecticut in the past represent a greater hazard to us than we will present to one another having past this legislation and learn to abide by it. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT:

Monday, May 1, 1978

15.

roc

Thank you, Senator. Senator Owens.

SENATOR OWENS:

Just as, ah, procedurally, I would ask that the amendment with respect to this matter be adopted first. I move the amendment. I don't think we have done that.

THE PRESIDENT:

The question is on the adoption of Senate A. All in favor please say Aye. Opposed Nay. A HAS BEEN ADOPTED, Senator. (I think this should be House Amendment A) (See below)

SENATOR OWENS:

At this time, I would move, unless there is objection, that the matter be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE PRESIDENT:

Without objection, the matter will be placed on Consent.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page nine of the Calendar, top item on the page

THE PRESIDENT:

senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

For the record, I don't believe there was on the last bill a Senate Amendment. I believe that we have adopted the bill in concurrence with the House. Just to clarify the record.

SENATOR OWENS:

Mr. President, I think that's correct and I think I

Monday, May 1, 1978

16.

roc

moved the bill initially as amended by House Amendment Schedule A and then I added some language that wasn't necessary. So I assume that it is just superfluous and we don't have to do anything about it. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT:

Thank you, that's correct.

THE CLERK:

Turning to page nine of the Calendar, top item on the page, Cal. 926, File 639. Favorable report of the joint standing Committee on Finance. Substitute for House Bill 5973.  
AN ACT CONCERNING PROPERTY ASSESSMENT FOR PURPOSES OF PROPERTY TAX IN A YEAR OF REVALUATION, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Beck. Senator Lieberman.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN: (10th)

Mr. President, I would move for acceptance and passage.

THE PRESIDENT:

Remarks, Senator?

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

I would actually prefer not to. I believe Senator Beck is nearby. Mr. President, why don't we pass it temporarily and go to page twelve because I see the distinguished chairman of the General Law Committee here.

Monday, May 1, 1978

148.

roc

Page twelve - Cal. 531, 541. Page thirteen - Cal. 557.

Page fourteen - Cal. 647, 763, 773. Page fifteen - Cal. 780

and Cal. 478. Page sixteen - Cal. 920, 971 and 972.

That completes the Consent Calendar.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I would move for adoption of the Consent Calendar.

THE PRESIDENT:

The machine is open. Please cast your vote. The machine is closed and locked. The Clerk will take a tally.

Total Voting . . . . .	35
Necessary for Passage . . . . .	18
Voting Yea . . . . .	35
Voting Nay . . . . .	0

THE CONSENT CALENDAR IS ADOPTED. SB 462, SB 50, HB 5703, SB 82, SB 539, SB 560, SB 497, HB 5849, SB 626, SB 541, SB 371, SB 4, SB 490, HB 5665, HJR 61, SJR 173, SJR 175, HB 5045 (See p. 3010 for Calendar nos.)

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules to allow for immediate transmittal to the House of all items that we have adopted today that should go to the House.

THE PRESIDENT:

Hearing no objections, it shall be done.

SENATOR LIEBERMAN:

Mr. President, on page seventeen, we had previously marked Cal. 760, AN ACT REFORMING CRIMINAL SENTENCING to take up today. I would like to ask now that that marking be changed to pass retaining.

Mr. President, on page eight, I would like to take up

H-199

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1978

VOL. 21  
PART 2  
403-787

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 15, 1978

5  
mcb

ferred to Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Change of reference. Favorable report of Joint Standing Committee on Transportation, sub-H.B. 5050, AN ACT CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT IN THIS STATE WITHOUT PROPER LICENSE OR CERTIFICATE.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to pass and be referred to Judiciary.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Change of Reference. Favorable report of Joint Standing Committee on Human Services, H.B. 5153, AN ACT CONCERNING EMERGENCY FUEL ASSISTANCE TO LOW INCOME FAMILIES NOT RECEIVING STATE OR LOCAL ASSISTANCE.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to pass; ought to be referred to Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Change of reference. Favorable report of Joint Standing Committee on Transportation, sub-H.B. 5045, AN ACT AUTHORIZING RIGHT OR LEFT TURNS ON RED TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to pass; ought to be referred to Judiciary.

House of Representatives

Wednesday, March 15, 1978

6  
mcb

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Change of reference. Favorable report of Joint Standing Committee on Public Health and Safety, sub-H.B. 5220, AN ACT CONCERNING APPROVAL OF PROSPECTIVE REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR HOSPITALS.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to pass; ought to be referred to Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Change of reference. Favorable report of Joint Standing Committee on Public Health and Safety, sub-H.B. 5217, AN ACT CONCERNING THE TRANSPORTATION OF MENTALLY ILL, DRUG DEPENDENT OR ALCOHOLIC PERSONS.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to pass; ought to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

So ordered.

THE CLERK:

Business from the Senate, Committee Reports. Change of Reference. Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs, S.B. 568, AN ACT CONCERNING SPECIAL MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSE PLATES FOR VETERANS WHO ARE FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR.

The Committee is of the opinion the bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Transportation.

H-205

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1978

VOL. 21  
PART 8  
3098-3565

Monday, April 24, 1978 181.3

Those absent and not voting . . . . . 16 efr

The bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 21 of the Calendar, Calendar 1036, Substitute for H.B. 5045, File 669, an Act authorizing right turns on red traffic lights. Favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations.

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage, and will you remark, sir?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment. Will he please call L.C.O. 3465, and I be allowed to summarize.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call L.C.O. 3465, House Amendment "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", L.C.O. 3465.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the gentleman from the 116th summarizing in lieu of Clerk's reading same? Hearing no such objection, the gentleman from the 116th first to summarize.

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. What this amendment does is allow in line 25 that right turns on red lights which is allowed in 48

Monday, April 24, 1978 182.

states be allowed in our State as of July 1, 1979. In line 50, efr  
October 1st, the date for the signs being put up, is in error,  
and this is changed to June 30th, 1979. Section 7 is deleted  
of the bill, and in lieu thereof is a sum of \$270,000 appropriated  
from F.A.C. to provide the money for the State to do the studies  
and put up the signs; and Section 8, \$170,000 is appropriated to  
the Department of Transportation to give to the cities...to reim-  
burse the cities and towns and boroughs for the cost they would  
incur in putting up signs to allow...to prohibit right turns on  
red on certain hazardous intersections. I move adoption of the  
amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The question is on adoption  
of House "A". Will you remark on House "A"?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. House "A" provides the funds up  
front so that the Department of Transportation can do the studies  
and put up the signs where right turns would be prohibited, so  
that by July 1, 1979, our State can join the rest of the Union  
in allowing right turns on red lights.

TAPE  
#26

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

ELINOR F. WILBER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam, and what is your question?

Monday, April 24, 1978 183.00

ELINOR F. WILBER:

efr

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Representative Reynolds, was the...did the Appropriations Committee review the funds which are included in your amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman care to respond?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, they did.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, through you, did they actually support this amount of money, because as I notice in the fiscal note it specifies that the...that a great deal of the money would, of course, be covered by Federal or matching dollar.

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman care to respond?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, they did, but the money has to be put out first before it could be recovered through grants from the Federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I understand that. The... you're telling me that the Appropriations Committee agreed that... to put this money up front through the F.A.C. account?

Monday, April 24, 1978 184.00

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

efr

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding with Representative Groppo, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Mr. Speaker, through you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes. You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

I don't see Mr. Groppo here. Let me ask again. Did the Committee vote on this particular amount of money, because since it is not in the bill I would assume that maybe they did not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman care to respond?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not sure of. I conferred with Representative Groppo on the appropriations that it was for this fund...for this bill...and he agreed that it would be from F.A.C. ...the funds would be made available.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the Committee...the Appropriations Committee...appears not to have agreed, at least as a committee, to this particular funds, although I am not objecting to the bill, and in fact would support

Monday, April 24, 1978 185.

it. I also have some hesitation about the amount of money which is allotted in this particular amendment, because I have some mistrust of the Department estimation of figures, and I do believe that these figures are probably high. Is Mr. Groppo...excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Is there any way that I could get Mr. Groppo's attention? No, he...Mr. Speaker, through you, may I ask a question...

MR. SPEAKER:

The distinguished lady from the 133rd is about to postulate a question to the distinguished gentleman from the 63rd. You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, may I ask Mr. Groppo whether he has seen the amendment which has been offered by Representative Reynolds, and for two sums...one of \$270,000 from the F.A.C. account to the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30th, and another, the sum of \$170,000 to the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30th, for the right turn on red lights? Mr. Groppo, have you seen that amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman care to respond?

JOHN G. GROPPA:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Monday, April 24, 1978 186.40, efr

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to discover, Representative Groppo, is whether the Appropriations Committee itself has approved this amendment. Did the Committee itself vote on this particular item?

MR. SPEAKER:

The gentleman care to respond?

JOHN G. GROPPPO:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations voted on the...an Act concerning right turns on red lights...and as far as the amendment, the Committee did not vote on it, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, madam.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Mr. Speaker, through you, may I ask Representative Groppo whether there are funds in the F.A.C. account for this particular amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you care to respond, sir?

JOHN G. GROPPPO:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there are funds in the F.A.C. Acts Without Appropriation, yes.

ELINOR F. WILBER:

Thank you. That satisfies me about the account, but it doesn't satisfy me that the Appropriations Committee did not review the sums in this. The reason that I feel that way is because the Transportation Department came before the Transportation Committee and ran through a list of numbers about how much

Monday, April 24, 1978 187<sup>PM</sup>

it was going to cost to produce right turn on red. It was clear, efr I think, to almost every member of the Committee that their funds ...that the amount that they estimated was extremely high and that the fact was a reluctance in the Transportation Department to go forward with this particular program. And I wish...and I'd just like to say I wish the Appropriations Committee had had an opportunity to quiz them a little more carefully, because I suspect that these amounts are going to be high. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, the question is on its adoption. 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 amended?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the floor, sir.

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

What this bill does is finally bring Connecticut in conformity with the rest of the nation. There's only four places in our nation where right turns on red are not under what we call the generally permissive law. In our State now you can make a right turn on red where posted. By this change, you will be able to make a right turn on red anywhere where not posted. The only other place is Massachusetts still does not have this law.

Monday, April 24, 1978 188

Connecticut as we...in our present state...do not have this law. efr  
New York City and Washington, D.C. The bill that you have before  
you incorporates a bill that we went through last year in the  
last session concerning pedestrians' rights and duties, and in  
sections of this bill...Sec. 4...we incorporate the pedestrian  
rights and duties, where it's outlined...the motorist's right  
and also his duties...what he has to do to watch out for pedes-  
trians...a bill that passed this House last year and was vetoed  
by the Governor. It's incorporated in the right turn on red  
light. We did that to uphold the concerns of the blind and the  
elderly who were a bit fearful that they would be neglected and  
they'd be overlooked in right turn on red legislation. I believe  
it's a good bill in that it incorporates both aspects...permis-  
sion to turn right on red, and also outlines and defines the  
duties of pedestrians...where they can cross, where they cannot  
cross...and the duties of motorists to observe and grant the  
right-of-way to pedestrians, especially when they're in a cross-  
walk. I believe this is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I  
move its adoption.

JAMES A. SWOMLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of this  
bill. I think there are many advantages to it. One, energy  
savings. We've had estimates ranging from a million gallons  
upward in terms of the gasoline it's going to save the motorists  
of this State. Two, it's going to have an impact on air quality.  
Connecticut has too much auto-produced pollution, and this bill  
will make a small dent in that problem. I understand that we

Monday, April 24, 1978 189

have a loss of revenue without this bill. It will relieve traffic congestion. It's going to give us uniform traffic laws with other states and in that way will be a safety factor for our State. I would commend the Committee for adding to it the pedestrian rights and responsibilities, and I urge support of this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you prepared to vote?

ROSALIND BERMAN:

Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the proponent of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please frame your question.

ROSALIND BERMAN:

Is it Representative Reynolds? How will this legislation affect streets that now have walk signs where cars must come to a stop on all sides?

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if there's a walk sign, and there's absolutely no pedestrian in the walkway, then the person will be allowed a right turn on red light, if it's not marked as a hazardous intersection. But if, you know, it's...the walk light's there, it's two o'clock in the morning, and there's nobody there, you're allowed the right turn on red light.

ROSALIND BERMAN:

What if it's at three o'clock in the afternoon, and pedestrians do not have the protection of the walk sign?

Monday, April 24, 1978 190

RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS:

efr

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this is what we're appropriating \$440,000...so that the traffic study will judge those intersections that this would not be feasible. It's not a blanket that we're going to turn everywhere, but the Uniform Traffic Safety Commission will study all intersections and will make a decision on each and every one...on all 7,000 in the United... in this State where they should turn and where they should not turn. I cannot tell you right now which ones will be judged safe or unsafe, but this will be done, and it will be done by June 30th of next year.

ROSALIND BERMAN:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will the members please be seated; the staff and guests come to the well. The machine will be opened. The machine is still open. Have all the members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk please announce the tally.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting . . . . .	138
Necessary for passage . . . . .	70
Those voting Yea. . . . .	133
Those voting Nay. . . . .	5
Those absent and not voting . . . . .	13

Monday, April 24, 1978 191.

The bill as amended is passed.

efr

THE CLERK:

Page 21 of the Calendar, Calendar 1037, Substitute for H.B. 5673, File 677, an Act establishing licensure for the practice of occupational therapy. Favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR

BENJAMIN N. DEZINNO, JR.:

Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance and passage of the Joint Committee's favorable report.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Would you remark, sir?

BENJAMIN N. DEZINNO, JR.:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Substitute H.B. 5673, occupational therapy licensures' time has finally come. The bill presently in the file calls for an appropriation of \$10,000 for a clerk to help implement regulations that have to be on board by July 1, 1979. I move acceptance of the Committee's favorable report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you remark further on the bill? If not...

VIRGINIA CONNOLLY:

I would agree with the remarks of Representative DeZinno. I would just like to add that this is a particularly good bill at this time with the implementation of home care for the elderly. I think it's going to serve a very fine purpose