Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 995	SA 85-108	1985
House	11522-11536	15p
Senate	3852-3854, 3862-3866 5509-5511, 5516-5517	17p.
Finance, Revenue + Bonding	642-651, 653-670	28p
	Total-	60p

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

H-419

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 31
11208-11591

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Have all the members voted? Please check the board to determine if your vote is properly recorded. The machine is still opened. The machine will be locked; clerk will take a tally.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, in the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Farr of the 19th in the affirmative.

Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 569, as amended by Senate "A", House "A" and House "B".

Total number voting	150
Necessary for passage	76
Those voting yea	150
Those voting nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The bill is passed not in concurrence with the Senate.

CLERK:

Calendar No. 912, Page 7, Substitute Senate Bill No. 995, File No. 1081, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT

OF A CONNECTICUT TECHNLOGY PARK AT STORRS, Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The motion is for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark, ma'am?

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In essence this file copy will allow the University of Connecticut to transfer a large portion of its land surrounding the University to a development technology park at Storrs to be developed by a group called the University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an amendment, LCO No. 8236 and would he call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Clerk please call LCO No. 8236, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 8236, offered by Rep. Emmons, Rep. Savage, Rep. Pelto.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The lady has requested permission to summarize. Is there objection? Hearing none, please proceed, Rep. Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this amendment does is establish what would be the board of directors of the group to which the land is being transferred. Until the board of directors of this particular incorporated organization resembles the appointments as listed in the amendment, the land transfer cannot occur.

The reason for the amendment was to assure that there was some legislative input into the board of directors as well as University input, and also that from the executive office. It is a new undertaking for the state to do and there was a feeling that there should be a broader base appointment power than just the board

of directors or the board of trustees of the University. I move its adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The motion is for adoption of House "A". Will you remark further on House "A"? Will you remark further? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor of adoption of House "A", please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The ayes have it. House "A" is adopted.

******

House Amendment Schedule "A".

In line 1, before "Notwithstanding" insert "(a)"
In line 117, strike "trustees" and insert the following in lieu thereof:
"directors of The University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc."
After line 138, insert subsection (b) as follows:
"(b) No conveyance of any interest in land pursuant to subsection (a) of this act shall be made by the board of trustees of The University of Connecticut unless, prior to such transfer, the certificate of incorporation and the bylaws of The University of Connecticut Educational

Properties, Inc. are amended as necessary to provide for membership of the board of directors as follows: (1) To be appointed by the governor, one person with experience in investments or banking and two persons with experience in business management; (2) the secretary of the office of policy and management, the commissioner of economic development, the commissioner of higher education and the chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Connecticut, or their respective designees; (3) the president of the University of Connecticut; (4) the vice-president of the University of Connecticut in charge of financial affairs; (5) the vice-president of the University of Connecticut in charge of graduate education and research; (6) the mayor of the town of Mansfield, or the mayor's designee; (7) one person appointed by each of, (A) the president pro tempore of the senate, (B) the speaker of the house of representatives, (C) the minority leader of the senate and (D) the minority leader of the house of representatives. Any agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a) of this act shall provide that any provisions in the certificate of incorporation or the bylaws of The University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc., added in compliance with this subsection or included prior to the effective date of this act, implementing the requirements of this subsection with respect to membership on the board of directors, shall not be amended at any time during which The University of Connecticut Educational Properties Inc. continues to hold any interest in land pursuant to subsection (a) of this act unless allowed or approved by a legislative enactment of the general assembly."

******

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Yes, Rep. Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

If you have gone, those that have gone out to Storrs realize that there is a fair amount of land that has not been developed. To some degree that is our less prosperous section of the state. It is the hope of the people that have come together with this technology park that it will be a link between Hartford and 128 in Massachusetts. And you will begin to bring down some of the high tech firms that will be coupled up with the graduate and research work at the school.

Their hope is to have graduate dorm facilities; to have a hotel; to be an asset both economically and educationally to that part of the state. It is not to use state money. The land will be donated or rented and all of the projects will have rental income to the state.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like now to yield to Rep. Savage, who has been very instrumental in this issue.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

You certainly may, ma'am. Rep. Savage, do you accept the yield?

REP. SAVAGE: (50th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SAVAGE: (50th)

Yes, this concept is not new. It is, however, very exciting. It is exciting for the University and I think it is exciting for the whole State of Connecticut. And particularly for the eastern Connecticut region.

We do look forward to the combination of the usage of the University professional staff combined with technical industry to give us an exciting new growth in an area that can well use it. This is somewhat of a think tank that we are proposing there and the spinoff industries may well locate in all regions of the state.

I find as I say that this is probably one of the most forward-looking measures to come before the General Assembly this year and I urge its passage.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Is it not true on this endeavor we are allowing the University of Connecticut to bypass the property review board?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Emmons, would you care to respond?

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker, that issue has been brought up and what we did, originally I had put, Mr. Speaker, through you, I have put a member of the property review board on there. What it does now is there are enough appointments, there is one appointment by each caucus leader. And it is my feeling if they are concerned to have somebody from the properties review board, then they would appoint someone from the properties review board.

It would have been, there could have been another amendment which would have required at least the approval of the properties review board for a model lease arrangement. However, I don't have an amendment such as that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Gelsi, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that answers my question. I think it would just take a simple yes or no. Are we or are we not allowing this industrial park to go into the University of Connecticut bypassing the properties review board? A very simple question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Emmons.

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

The answer is yes.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Thank you very much, madam. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Gelsi, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this industrial part. I think the endeavors that they want to take in the UCONN campus is many. And I think they would be probably to the benefit of all the citizens of this state and not only eastern Connecticut.

I made the point on the properties review board for one reason and one reason only. The only way that that industrial park could go in, it would die if it had

to go through the properties review board. They have to be able to move. If they get a major hotel complex to come in there, they have got to be able to move and build that complex. They are not going to stick around all month or two years to wait until somebody gives them approval.

And that's what I want you to keep in mind when you come up with the speaker's plan for the accountability board to transportation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. CUNNINGHAM: (148th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Cunningham.

REP. CUNNINGHAM: (148th)

Mr. Speaker, first, through you, to Rep. Emmons, if I may pose a couple of queries. Mr. Speaker, through you, Rep. Emmons, is this supposed to be profit making, non-profit, or subsidized?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Emmons, would you care to respond?

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that it is not supposed to be subsidized. That the Connecticut Educational Properties, it is my understanding, is non-profit. And I think it is supposed to be an effort to be self-sustaining and to broaden the economic viability of that area.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Cunningham, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CUNNINGHAM: (148th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure on that answer but if I may, at least, pose a second query, through you to the proponent. Is there private property available in that area?

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Emmons, would you care to respond?

REP. EMMONS: (101st)

Mr. Speaker, I really have not had the surveyors map. Reading the definition in the file, it is my understanding that this land abuts and is part of the original land grant and is part of the University per se, although there are no buildings on it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Cunningham, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CUNNINGHAM: (148th)

Yes, I still wish, Mr. Speaker, to know, perhaps if I could inquire, through you of Rep. Savage, perhaps he knows the answer to that question. Is there nearby private property available.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Savage, would you care to respond?

REP. SAVAGE: (50th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly there is some private property in the area, however, there is no private property that is as desirable or as close to the University facilities as this strip which is due north of the campus and in a block there, and lends itself to the purpose very, very well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Cunningham, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CUNNINGHAM: (148th)

Okay, yes, Mr. Speaker, there being apparently sufficient land in the University perhaps without this, I perhaps would not oppose selling this land, but to lease it for one dollar to have the state in effect,

if not directly, subsidizing the entire initiative, I think is a mistake.

I think if we have, and I think we do, a sufficiently strong state university, it is sufficiently desirable for certain outside research groups to move into the area. And they can do so without this bill passing. Then we can have such development and it can and will succeed. I think history has shown us that in most cases where government goes in to try to push a direction, it does not work and ends up costing the taxpayers more and more money.

I reluctantly must oppose this piece of legislation on those grounds. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Jack Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill as I have some of the high hopes that Rep. Savage outlined for this bill. But I must say that the first couple of lines disturb me to no end and I share the problem that Rep. Gelsi has, that indeed this whole

venture is going to be done outside of a properties review board.

And it disturbs me a little bit that the University is coming in asking for this exemption right off the bat. Because as someone who has been here for a few years, I can tell you that some people in this Chamber, I know some people are no longer here in this Chamber, got very badly burned several years when UCONN came in and asked for an exemption under the hazardous waste citing council.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended by House "A"? Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. An immediate roll call is ordered. Clerk will please announce the roll call.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. All members please return to the Chamber immediately. The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. All members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Have all the members voted? Please check the board to determine if your vote is properly recorded. All the republican leadership team should vote. The machine will be locked; clerk will take a tally.

Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 995, as amended by House "A".

Totaly number voting	150
Necessary for passage	76
Those voting yea	147
Those voting nay	3
Those absent and not voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The bill is passed as amended, not in concurrence with the Senate.

CLERK:

Calendar No. 913, Substitute Senate Bill No. 922, File No. 1007, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION, (as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A"), Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

S-241

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 11
3525-3909

THE CHAIR:

Do you wish to move it to the consent calendar?

SENATOR GUNTHER:

If there's no objection.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. The Senate will stand at ease.

THE CLERK:

Page 10, calendar No. 712, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 995, File 1081. An Act Concerning the Development of a Connecticut Technology Park At Storrs.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

We're on page 12, first item, excuse me. Page 10, first item on that page, calendar NO. 712. Are we ready to proceed? Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk, please call the amendment.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 7278 introduced by Senator McLaughlin.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President. I move acceptance of the amendment and take leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, you may proceed.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President. This amendment changes the make-up of the board of the development of the technology park at UConn now called the Ukepi Project to change it slightly to include all of the current members of the board as sanctioned by the board of trustees at the University plus two additional designees, the chairman of the state properties review board and two persons, actually three, total, two persons having experience in business management appointed by the Governor. The affect of the change will be to add three individuals to the current board make-up, making for a little bit more experience on the board and perhaps a little bit more wherewithal particularly in the properties review board

addition. I move acceptance of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Wish to remark further? Senator Kevin Johnston.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Mr. President, I just received the amendment. I agree in concept with coming up with a new advisory board with additional members. I'm not sure I totally agree with who they will be, and I think I would ask if we could PT this and come back to it in a few minutes after the next bill.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection? Hearing no objection, the item is PTd.

THE CLERK:

Page 6, calendar 696, Substitute for House Bill 7747, File 701. An Act Concerning Statutory Liens.

Somebody has to move to change the marking.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Richard Johnston.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, I would move that we change the marking from pass retain to taking it up this day.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, you may proceed.

THE CLERK:

A roll call vote in process in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. There's a roll call vote in process in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Zinsser. Senator Zinsser. Thank you. Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 33 yea, zero nay. The consent calendar is adopted. Senator Streeter.

SENATOR STREETER:

Mr. President, I would like to have the record note that Senator Zinsser has left on legislative business.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The record will note. All right. You may proceed.

THE CLERK:

Page 10, calendar 712, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 995. An Act Concerning The Development Of A Connecticut Technology Park At Storrs.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Mr. President, we had previously passed this temporarily.

I would like to request that the amendment, as previously called, Amendment LCO 7278, be withdrawn. S.Am.A

THE CHAIR:

The amendment is withdrawn. Further amendments?

THE CLERK:

No further amendments.

THE CHAIR:

No further amendments? We're on the bill.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President. I have previously asked for the acceptance. The bill before us establishes a method whereby there can be a - I'm going to yield to Senator Giulietti, but let me just state simply that the bill, in effect, allows for the facilitation of the agreement between the University of Connecticut, the state and the UCEPI Board for the development of a science park and I respectfully yield to Senator Giulietti whose district encompasses the proposed park.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Giulietti.

SENATOR GIULIETTI:

Yes. This bill has received the unanimous support of the Finance Committee. What the UCEPI project is, it's going to build a research and development science park on the Univer-

sity of Connecticut and potentially give two to three thousand new jobs needed in eastern Connecticut. This is something good for UConn, for the staff, for the students and for the people of eastern Connecticut. It is also going to raise tax revenue for the town of Mansfield. It's something I'm very excited about. It's received bi-partisan support. Kevin Johnston's been very supportive of it as well as the whole Finance Committee. I urge your support on this bill. I wish to put it on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kevin Johnston.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Mr. President, thank you, and I appreciate it. I just wanted to thank the members of the circle for holding up this bill for a little while. I think we can resolve any amendment down in the House. As Senator Giulietti mentioned, it's a bi-partisan effort of all the people in northeastern Connecticut. I think this bill will help to expedite this project and put some people to work and get some tax dollars into the town of Mansfield, and I would urge your support.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes, Mr. President. I think it's noteworthy that the chamber be informed of why this bill is before us. I think we all recognize the benefit of a science park such as the New Haven Park in Yale University or other science parks throughout the country. The specific reason for this being before us is this will give autonomy to the board, the University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc., the UCEPI Board, give them autonomy from the Governor, the Department of Administrative Services and the Properties Review Board. It will allow a developer to have the facility at his disposal to transact a lease agreement with the state and consequent lease agreements with potential lessees at that location. This is a unique change for us with Properties Review, but I think it is the only way that this project would go forward. I urge your support. Mr. President, we'd like to suspend the rules to transfer it immediately ...

THE CHAIR:

We haven't voted on it yet.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

... and I'd like to have a roll to do that.

THE CHAIR:

All right. Clerk, please make an announcement for roll call.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Question before the chamber is a motion to adopt calendar No. 712, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 995, File No. 1081. Machine is open. Please record your vote. Senator Consoli. Senator Matthews. Senator Gunther. Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 31 yea, zero nay. The bill is adopted. Senator Eaton, while you were downstairs, we did vote on the consent calendar. Do you wish to be recorded?

SENATOR EATON:

Yes, Mr. President, that's my purpose for rising, and if I may, I think ...

THE CHAIR:

Do you wish to be recorded in the affirmative?

SENATOR EATON:

In the affirmative on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

You also have a request for suspension of the rules?

S-246

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 16
5199-5517

Scuedule "A", LCO No. 7785. The machine is open. Please record your vote. Has everyone voted? Senator Larson. Senator Avallone. Senator Robertson. Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 6 yea, 27 nay. The amendment is defeated. Further amendments?

THE CLERK:

No further amendments.

THE CHAIR:

No further amendments. Senator Connair.

SENATOR CONNAIR:

Mr. President, I guess that I don't know where the money is supposed to come from under a circumstance like this. I guess we'll just have to go looking for it, and under the circumstances, I still would urge adoption of the bill and with no objection put it on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, Finance, Revenue and Bonding. Substitute Senate Bill 995. An Act Concerning The Development Of A Connecticut Technology Park At Storrs.

House passed with House "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. That's easy for the Clerk to say. I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Any amendments?

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes. There are no amendments.

THE CLERK:

No amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Yes. The issue before us, the main vehicle having been here at a previous time, is House Amendment "A" which, in effect, changes the makeup of the board, the UCEPI Board, the University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc. Board. It does several things. It deletes the reference to the University of Connecticut Board and leaves just the chairman of that board and where it makes reference to one person with experience in business management, adds another member with exper-

ience in business management. The board, for the most part, stays the same. You will recall that this is the issue of the development of a science park on property adjacent to the University of Connecticut. I think it is of vital importance to this state, to the University of Connecticut itself, and to that part of the state. If there are no objections, I would urge that this be put on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Appropriations. Substitute Senate Bill 849. An Act Providing A Grant For The Saint Vincent De Paul Society In Waterbury.

House passed with House "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Markley.

SENATOR MARKLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Move for acceptance of the bill and rejection of House Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to reject House "A". Will you remark?

SENATOR MARKLEY:

Yes. House Amendment "A" added an additional appropriation

SENATOR LARSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was previously out of the chamber and missed the vote on Senate Bill 888 and I wish to be recorded in the affirmative.

THE CHAIR:

The record will so note. Senator McLaughlin, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Mr. President, I would, due to the fact that the UCEPI Board is meeting within the next two weeks, I would like to suspend the rules for the immediate transmittal to the Governor for his signature on Senate Bill 995.

THE CHAIR:

It will require a roll call. That was placed on consent, Senator McLaughlin. You wish a roll call?

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Mr. President, I'd like to request that that be withdrawn from consent and I would like to request a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk will please make an announcement for immediate roll call.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call's been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. An immediate roll

call's been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

We're dealing with Substitute Senate Bill 995. This was previously placed on the consent calendar. Senator McLaughlin moved to remove it from the consent calendar and because of that, it requires a roll call vote, so now we're having a roll call vote on Senate Bill 995, File No. 1081. The machine is open. Please record your vote. Senator Johnston. Richard Johnston. Senator Avallone. Senator Giulietti. Has everyone voted? Machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote. Result of the vote, 35 yea, zero nay. The bill is adopted.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLaughlin.

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

I would like to move or request that the rules be suspended so that we may immediately transmit this to the Governor for his signature.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Truglia, do you wish to be heard on this?

SENATOR TRUGLIA:

Not on this.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

FINANCE,
REVENUE, AND
BONDING
PART 2
366-740

1985

1
kbm FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING

State Capitol
Room W-58
May 3, 1985
9:00 A.M.

PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: Senator McLaughlin

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: McLaughlin, Giulietti, Johnston, DiBella

REPRESENTATIVES: Abercrombie, Benson, Biafore, Casey, Dickinson, Emmons, Fahrbach, Flinn, Gelsi, Karbowski, Karsky, Kezer, Luppi, Pelto, Perry, Rapoport, Schlesinger, Savage, Smoko, Testa, Torpey, Tuthill, Varrone, Wenc, Young

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: --tonight for a second 11:00 session, so
ss. 1 we have 33% of our Senate membership here. That's not bad. I am Senator Jamie McLaughlin. On my left is Sen. Jim Giulietti, and John, what time did you finish last night?

REP. PELTO: About 11:30.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Rep. Jonathan Pelto. Our first speaker in the first hour, and I'm going to see if I can move things along and get back on schedule, and the first portion is for Legislators and agency officials. The first speaker is Commissioner John Carson.

COMM. CARSON: Thank you, Senator. Good morning. I will file a paper and not my comments, and I will try to allow you to get back onto the schedule. My name is John Carson and I am Commissioner of Commissioner of Economic Development for the State of Connecticut.

I appreciate being here today to speak in support of and in fact in strong support of Senate Bill 995. In fact, it is of such importance in my view to the state's economic development efforts that I will not try to make any com-

COMM. CARSON: (continued)
ments on other bills that this Committee is still dealing with that are parochially of interest to our agency.

I do speak as the Commissioner of Economic Development and relative to the economic development aspects of Senate Bill 995. I would also hope that my 10 years of service in the Department of Economic Development, as well as my current position as the President of the National Association of State Development Agencies would bring through my brief comments a view that does specifically refer to the economic development aspect.

I would note to the Committee, however, that I am also a member of the Board of Ucepe. It seems to me that the research science park of the University of Connecticut is extremely vital to not only the University and a need for the flagship university in the state of Connecticut which will benefit from the existence of a research park, but at the same time the business, the technology in the State of Connecticut would benefit from the University.

In addition, a research park at the University of Connecticut, in my mind, is a vital ingredient and element in the effort that my organization, under the direction of Governor O'Neill, is undertaking to develop a major northeastern Connecticut development strategy as we have done in the Naugatuck Valley and have done so successfully in that part of the State.

We are hopeful that in the next few months we will be able to undertake a formal, cooperative effort with chief elected officials, legislators, business and other interests in northeastern Connecticut, and it is my view that the existence of the science park at the University will be a critical element in our efforts to work cooperatively with that part of the State, which is in need of continued development and support.

Finally, it is my very strong belief that the University research park is a critical element within the overall State's economic development strategy. When I testified before Appropriations and Planning and Development earlier this session, I indicated that we have a number of strategies, urban economic development, (inaudible) in

COMM. CARSON: (continued)
industry, business retention, international high technology, and I am strongly convinced that the existence of a research park at the University of Connecticut will support that strategy of high technology, economic development that we are undertaking.

The high tech, as you probably well know, is an important aspect to the State's economy; in excess of 725 companies in the State of Connecticut are in high technology, with total employment of about 155,000. That is fully 1/3 of our entire manufacturing employment level in the State of Connecticut. By any definition, Connecticut ranks anywhere from second to sixth in terms of the various public and private rankings of states in terms of dependency and representation within the high technology area.

I have many examples of the efforts that we are undertaking, and the loans that we are making for high technology. We are extremely pleased that within the past few days the Southbury Planning and Zoning Commission approved the IBM project, over 2,500 jobs. High technology, its impact on our residents, its positive impact is moving forward and the existence of the science park will continue that momentum.

It seems to me that there is already in place a wide commitment, a deep commitment, to high technology in the State of Connecticut. I will not go through it, but I will be happy to share with your staff a number of the critical elements that have come out of Governor O'Neill's high technology effort. The inner agency cooperative efforts that cut across Education, Environmental Protection, Labor Department, and the Department of Economic Development.

We have millions of dollars and much in the way of State resources are being committed to this very important job-generating activity here in the State of Connecticut. I also would be happy to provide with you a listing that recently appeared in one of the major trade magazines in development, business facilities, in which over 78 university-related science parks are referenced as being in existence and I also believe and continue to believe

COMM. CARSON: (continued)
that Connecticut is at the forefront of economic development. We must maintain ourselves in that forefront and I think that there is ample evidence that this is an effort both in the academic and development world that is taking hold here in this country and that we, in Connecticut, in order to be responsible to the citizens and responsible public officials must see that we ourselves are doing the same effort.

I would just remind the Committee, and the Committee I'm sure needs no reminder, that this State is already making a commitment to a science park. Through my agency, we provided in the first round $2.3 million in New Haven for the Cooperative Olin City of New Haven the State of Connecticut Yale University Science Park. And I think it makes good public sense. I feel a strong obligation that the State of Connecticut can provide not only $2.3 million in the first round, and there are requests coming forward.

I would expect in the next year that we would provide at least an additional $2 million in New Haven, that it is necessary, it is a reasonable obligation, more importantly an outstanding opportunity to provide the support for a science research park at the University at Storrs.

In conclusion, I guess the questions might be raised from the point of view of economic development, why have an economic development effort that includes a science park at the University of Connecticut? You just would have to reference very briefly a major seminal work in economic development that was prepared by the Joint Economic Committee that ranks number four in the criteria for regional location factors, academic institutions.

So you have ample technical and demographic data that shows that our academic institutions are key elements within the economic development.

Secondly, the university park at Storrs would complement our existing park at New Haven. There is strongly in my mind no conflicts, no competition. They are different environments, they are focusing on different opportunities,

COMM. CARSON: (continued)
and I think that the commitment of the State of Connecticut to the science park at U Conn in no way diminishes our commitment to New Haven, nor should we be concerned of spreading our resources in an inter-state, intra-state competitive effort.

As said earlier, competition, 78 other science related parks in the United States.

Fourth, I think the State can carry out this effort. Through my office, over the past number of years, we have committed $85 million to local industrial parks throughout the State of Connecticut with communities. We have over 8,000 acres that have been acquired and disposed of in a very effective, efficient, and productive manner through the efforts of our office and local communities. And we have over 27,000 jobs in those industrial parks that we have provided.

Fifth, it will complement, as I said earlier, our development strategy that is now being developed for northeastern Connecticut.

Sixth, it seems to me that the flagship university does require for its own uses a science park, but very importantly as our experience has indicated, the existence of a major leader in research facility at a major university such as the University of Connecticut, I think, will be an aspect that will maintain Connecticut as a leader of economic development in the years ahead and having the third lowest unemployment rate in the nation, I think that kind of strong performance will be solidified by a favorable action by this Committee and also by the Connecticut General Assembly to support the development of that park.

I thank the Committee for allowing the opportunity for me to make my presentation today. I would be happy to answer any questions and will continue dialogue with you, Senator, and Representatives, with you as the next few days go on.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: John, I have a question. And let's get to the heart of the matter. At least that reason for our

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: (continued)
being here. Prospective of some of the comments I think we can expect from some others before we're done, including agency officials, what do you regard as the reasons for the singular approach that we're taking here, viz-a-viz, properties review. And some of our administrative procedures that we have had in place.

COMM. CARSON: I think, and I think a number of other speakers after me will probably address that, I think that one, discussions were held by those of us who have (inaudible) post within the administration who are committed to the research park at the University to how this could be expedited to make sure that what has been talked for the past 2 years becomes reality.

Secondly, the experiences that I think I have had in development and others have had is that to effectively market this park, to effectively make the commitment of the State pay the dividends in terms of jobs and ratcheting up the view of the University of Connecticut, not only in Connecticut but increasing its positive view throughout this nation, requires us to be able to deal in a very businesslike manner, to move forward and to implement the master plan for that park, and that I think the consensus amongst a number of us has been that the existing processes do not lend themselves on a case-by-case basis to effectively achieving the goal of what the park is.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: John, may I infer that our administrative procedure is not businesslike?

COMM. CARSON: Not necessarily not businesslike; it is, I think the inference that I would make is that that there are processes that are necessary in certain instances and based on experiences that we have had, that we can in all honesty and with good faith and intentions and more importantly with good judgment, move more effectively by altering the process. I think this is only speaking for myself. Just because a process exists does not necessarily (1) mean that it is appropriate in 100% of the cases, and (2) I think we have the experience over the past few years that our environment is changing in that what we are attempting to do is to make the University

COMM. CARSON: (continued)
an integral part of our development efforts, if we are trying to bring the benefit to the University, to what it is we are doing for people to create and obtain jobs that in this instance a very serious consideration has to be given to altering the process somewhat so that we not only create the park, but more importantly we get it developed as quickly as possible for the benefit of the University, for the benefit of the State, for the benefit of the community as well.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Are there other questions from members of the Committee? John, thanks for coming.

COMM. CARSON: My appreciation. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity, Senator.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: John DiBiaggio.

MR. DI BIAGGIO: Mr. Chairman, as President of the University of Connecticut, I am pleased to speak in favor of Raised Committee Bill 995, An Act Concerning the Development of the Connecticut Technology Park at Storrs.

Four years ago, we began the enormous task of creating a research and technology park at the University of Connecticut. We began by conducting feasibility studies, designed not only to test the market for such an enterprise, but also to identify the organizational and procedural methods by which the State agency might pursue such a development project.

After assurance of the vitality of the project itself, we established the recommended vehicle for carrying out the project. A private, non-profit corporation for the chartered purpose of enhancing the University of Connecticut and eastern Connecticut. We then undertook a competitive selection process for our legal counsel and accountant and a national search for a master developer.

By May of 1983, we were ready to proceed in earnest for the development of a multi-faceted program intended to bring our Storrs campus a hotel conference center, new housing for the community, as well as desperately needed

MR. DI BIAGGIO: (continued)
married student housing, and most importantly, a research industrial park conceived around the prospect of direct cooperation between the University and private sector research and development efforts.

We envision the cymbiotic and mutually beneficial relationship between the University and the corporate community. Our early marketing surveys confirmed those beliefs. Our library, computers, information services, laboratories, and other facilities proved very attractive to private firms with a strong interest in technology. Our faculty, which I believe to be one of the finest in the nation, offered the expertise necessary to complement private research.

Even our bucolic setting, as it was referred to in the marketing reports, was highly prized by corporate researchers. In time we found interest in an incubator facility to encourage and foster the growth of fledgling enterprises. The kinds of enterprises which today make up the Silicon Valley in California and Route 128 in Boston.

Concurrent with the planning and conceptual development of the park, we began the process of seeking the many approvals necessary to proceed with the actual construction of Connecticut technology park. Here the results of our efforts were not so encouraging. We found that, in spite of the flexibility potentially offered by our nonprofit corporation design and despite the very best efforts of Commissioner Friedman and his staff at the Department of Administrative Services, we simply could not find sufficient flexibility within existing statutes to allow the leasing of the development parcel to Ucepe in a form which would allow it to be marketed to the firms which will be the end users of the land itself.

After several months of thoroughly exploring all acceptable administrative procedures and statutory references, we concluded jointly, that is Ucepe and Administrative Services, that we would have to seek the legislation before you, or lose the project altogether.

MR. DI BIAGGIO: (continued)

This decision was not only reached very thoughtfully, but I might add and as you might guess, very reluctantly. University trustees and the directors of Ucepe both appreciate the contribution which can be achieved by our working with the Department of Administrative Services. We have discovered that we can work together very well and we intend to continue to do so after passage of this legislation, just as we did before.

This legislation will not prevent our cooperation. It will simply allow us to move that cooperation to a more flexible environment in which a project such as ConnTech can flourish.

With your approval of Bill 995 in this session, we can break ground before year ends and be fully under construction on phase 1 of the park in the Spring. By the end of 1986, the first tenants may be moving in and the promise of this undertaking may begin to be realized. The town, the eastern Connecticut community, and the entire State of Connecticut will benefit. Tax revenues, jobs, economic revitalization, and a brighter future will be the result. And no beneficiary will be better served by ConnTech than the University itself.

For you see, this project will assist us in our efforts to attract and retain top faculty and the most promising graduate students. I will provide very deep linkages with some of the technologic leaders of corporate Connecticut and corporate America. It will do much to keep our State at the economic forefront of the national economy.

In time, this project will produce net revenues. While that fact is significant, it is the enhancement of the University, the strengthening of the community, and the economic development of the State of Connecticut, which motivates me now to ask for your favorable action on this legislation.

I thank you and I would be pleased to answer any questions you have. I might add, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Frank Rich, a member of our Board of Trustees, is here, he is

MR. DI BIAGGIO: (continued)
also a member of the Ucepe Board, he is also one of Connecticut's foremost developers himself, having developed virtually all the buildings that have been constructed in Stamford, the Frank D. Rich (inaudible).

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: If there are no questions for Dr. DiBiaggio, there are shovels in the finance room and we will get to work. I don't believe there are. Thank you, Dr. DiBiaggio. Our next speaker from the Department of Transportation Bureau of Aeronautics, help me, I needed that, --

MR. WILLIAM COLACRAI: My name is William Colacrai, representing the Department of Transportation, Bureau of Aeronautics. Speaking on Senate Bill 997, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A PROCEDURE FOR THE REGISTRATION OF ALL AIRCRAFT IN THE STATE WITH THE COMMISSIONER OF TRANSPORTATION.

The Department opposes this bill. The Federal Aviation Administration presently is responsible for the registration of all aircraft. At present in the State, the registration of aircraft and the comparison of that registration with tax revenues to municipalities, that is a personal property tax on aircraft, is strictly a municipal responsibility. The Department of Transportation has no responsibility or jurisdiction in this matter.

Obviously, if the personal property tax on aircraft were eliminated and a registration fee collected in its place, then there would be a need for State government to become involved in the registration of aircraft. At this time, there is no need and therefore we oppose the legislation.

It should also be noted that if the registration did pass we would require additional staffing, possibly two to three inspectors and a clerk, and the fiscal impact of this would be in the area of $100-150,000. Thank you. Are there any questions?

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Bill, I certainly can understand why you don't want to do any more work. Your job is probably

REP. GELSI: Could we also consider, then, giving them complete property tax on the airport other than the actual airport operation? You know, we're now looking at industrial parks at the airport. That might be fine for the State of Connecticut; it sure doesn't do anything for Windsor Locks.

MR. COLACRAI: I'm not prepared at this time to answer that.

REP. GELSI: We're also buying land around there that was on taxation and taking it off.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Are there further questions? Thanks, Bill. Our next speaker is Bill Weaver, Executive Director of the State Properties Review Board.

MR. WILLIAM WEAVER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and Mr. Chairman. I wm William G. Weaver, Jr., the Executive Director of the State Property Review Board. And I have been asked to present the Board's position on Bill 995.

The Board is in opposition to this bill. Most of you have probably received a copy of the Board's position, but for the record I would like to read it; it's relatively short.

The State Property Review Board endorses the idea of a research development park, with hotel and conference centers, offices and residential facilities on the 390-acre parcel of State land adjacent to the University of Connecticut campus at Storrs.

The Statute 10-a140 as written provides sufficient authority to proceed with this project. A lease to effect transfer of this large property to the University of Connecticut educational property, known as Ucepe, was prepared and submitted to the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services and the State Property Review Board for review and approval. Both of these agencies were of the opinion that this lease did not provide sufficient accountability and DAS suggested specific modifications to correct this.

The University of Connecticut objects to the suggested modifications, and therefore it appears that the purpose

MR. WEAVER: (continued)
of this subject bill is to eliminate the requirements to comply with the suggested modifications and provide the University of Connecticut income property (inaudible) with complete autonomy which also eliminates the requirement of approval of the Governor, Department of Administrative Services, and the Property Review Board.

If you have any questions, I'd like to try and deal with them.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Are there questions from the Committee? Sen. Giulietti?

SEN. GIULIETTI: Yes. You seem to say there wasn't enough oversight. Don't you think the Ucepe Board is sufficient, seeing that there's going to be, I guess the Governor gets to appoint four members. Don't you think that's sufficient?

MR. WEAVER: Ucepe is a non-profit independent corporation which there is no accountability as far as the Board can see. Once this 390 acres of land is transferred for $1.00 for 99 years, then Ucepe has complete control of it, and even the auditors have no right to audit the (inaudible).

SEN. GIULIETTI: But is that bad? I don't see a problem with the Ucepe Board having complete control of it, since it's going to be done with private funds. Why do you see that as a problem?

MR. WEAVER: You're turning over 390 acres of taxpayer's land and the taxpayers will not realize any of the profit of that in any way, except through Ucepe, who is unadcountable to anyone except the Ucepe Board of Directors, which can change.

SEN. GIULIETTI: But when you look at the merits of what is being done with the land vs. what is going to be done in the future, doesn't that really negate that argument?

MR. WEAVER: The Board is very much in favor of this whole park, it has been since we were first involved in it two years ago. I think this is what should be done out there, and we think that the project and the plans and everything that Ucepe has put forward are fine; however, there is only

MR. WEAVER: (continued)
ass. 2 place that the State has any control and that is the transfer of this land to Ucepe. And we feel that the modifications that have been suggested by the Commissioner of Administrative Services and the Property Review Board are reasonable to give accountability to this project for the people of the State of Connecticut.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Bill, the Commissioner is up next. Perhaps we can address some of those questions to him. Sen. Johnston?

SEN. JOHNSTON: Just one question, Mr. Weaver. As I heard you reading the letter, you said of course the Department of Administrative Services will no longer have an absolute say on this, and almost inferring that they really want to get heavily involved and approve every part of this plan, but I am led to believe that actually the DAS is supportive of this bill.

MR. WEAVER: I think (inaudible, not speaking into microphone). and the Board originally turned down the very first lease as not being responsive and not being appropriate so that it was revised and returned again, at which time the Commissioner of Administrative Services and the Board in concert felt that this lease did not adequately protect the State and he, through his Attorney General, revised it and resubmitted to the Board and the Board and he agreed that this would properly protect the State. So the Board and the Commissioner are in the same position of endorsing the controls that are in this lease.

SEN. JOHNSTON: My understanding, through talking to the Commissioner of DAS, is that he not only supports this and has been working with the Ucepe Board, but feels that the statutes themselves have really held him back from helping to expedite the project. That's my understanding and I will, through further testimony, will --

MR. WEAVER: You'd have to explore that position (inaudible, not speaking into microphone).

REP. BENSON: Jamie, please.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Rep. Benson?

REP. BENSON: Did your Board foresee any other possible use of this land?

MR. WEAVER: We didn't look into that possibility. We are in favor of this research park. We feel it should go forward, and we also feel that there should be a certain accountability when you transfer 390 acres of land to a non-profit corporation that has no accountability to the State other than through (inaudible, not speaking into microphone).

REP. BENSON: Would you think that a possible compromise could be that your Board and the U Conn would maybe have some joint control of the property?

MR. WEAVER: We don't have control of anything per se. Once we've passed the lease, the lease is thencontrolled by what would the Commissioner of Administrative Services, who would administer the lease. Once we have approved a lease, then we no longer have any further control in it.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: All set, Carl?

REP. BENSON: Yes.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Further questions? Thanks, Bill. Our next speaker, and last speaker, unless there are others, on the legislative and agency portion, is Commissioner Eli Freedman, Department of Administrative Services.

COMM. FREEDMAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Eli Freedman, Commissioner of Administrative Services, and I am testifying on the Ucepe bill; I don't have the number in front of me.

After listening to the other speakers, I think it might be well for us to retrace a little bit of the history from our viewpoint, in the Department of Administrative Services, which has the Bureau of Public Works, which is responsible for leasing for the State.

I think we first have to look at the existing law which we are working with at the present time, which our Department and myself in particular feels is really very, really not very appropriate to handle such an extensive

COMM. FREEDMAN: (continued)
and complicated land development as contemplated by the University of Connecticut and the Ucepe Corporation.

That section 10A-140. This was written, someone told me, 25 or 30 years ago. Its main purpose at that time, I think, was to help authorize leases of property of the State owned by the University of Connecticut to service type facilities, such as cleaning establishment, ice cream parlors, and so forth. And I don't know what the history was at that time, but there must have been some kind of a problem because this bill really represented an overkill. This is the only bill that I know that puts the Governor and Commissioner responsible to the Governor and a regulatory agency such as the State Property Review Board on an even keel.

They all have even responsibility here to approve leases of this type, for barber shops and cleaning establishments and later on they took on some kind of dormitory type development. Very inappropriate. There's no other bill I know of requires the Governor's approval of the land transaction. And certainly this one is (inaudible) unique as that these 3 agencies should have equal say here. It's the traditional way the Property Review Board works with leases of the State of Connecticut is they review what the Bureau of Public Works of our Department negotiates and then passes on them or modifies them or whatever, until they are satisfied.

In this case, they are not regulating or reviewing our lease, but they are, they have separate and independent responsibility to approve, along with our Department and the Governor's office. It's a very unusual situation.

This existing bill requires that the Department of Administrative Services approve every single transaction that takes place in the execution of the development, as contemplated. Every single transfer of land, sale land, lease of land, whatever that will take place in this development, would have to come before the Department of Administrative Services.

There are several other issues here involved, which are of a concern to me, which I will take up in a moment.

COMM. FREEDMAN: (continued)

Probably one of the most important things that we saw as we were coming along here was that this whole effort had been in existence for several years before it came to our Department for review. Our Department then found itself in the situation of having to negotiate a lease on behalf of the University of Connecticut with the Ucepe Corporation which, in effect, was very difficult because the major transaction had already taken place and that was between the University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc., UCEPI, and the developer who was to develop that land.

So we had a situation here where, from a practical point of view, two years, three years after the fact, we are now put in the situation of now second-guessing in transactions that have already been developed. And being restricted in the flexibilities that we could employ because of the nature of the law which this project was proceeding under, which is very restrictive and really doesn't give the Commissioner of Administrative Services the flexibility to deal with this kind of thing.

And I have been in the development business from a point of view of a city manager, a county administrator, for over 20 years, and you know, in the old days before redevelopment or development, the work of construction was primarily handled within towns and cities by a public works department, by a public works director, public works commissioner, or a city engineer. Then all of a sudden, in the early '50's, came the idea of urban redevelopment and industrial development and a variety of other things where government got involved in large-scale land transfers and schemes with private enterprise.

It was very clear that the traditional powers that resided in the public works commissioner or public works director which were day in and day out, road building, construction, a variety of municipal (inaudible) were inadequate, and so they created redevelopment agencies and development commissions and provided special laws, flexibilities, recognizing the problems of the real estate market and the fact that you need two to tango to get something done.

So, from my viewpoint, we have a lot of organizations within

COMM. FREEDMAN: (continued)
the state whose main responsibility is to audit, to regulate and very few to go out and get something done. It's my estimation, I guess, you know, I guess I could sit and say, hey, listen, the way I see the law, this is the way I would do and now I'm second guessing the work that's been done in the last two years. The legislature could go out of session and meanwhile the realities of the situation is weakened, the whole thing could fall apart because of the effect of existing law and my inability as the commissioner under existing law to provide the flexibility.

So I said to myself, look at, this project (inaudible). This is something that's going to benefit the university and the state and I know it. It'd be tragic. Because of the fact that we have people who have the guts to innovate here, you know, they went ahead, to move this thing ahead, to let this thing fall through the cracks because my little law, my little powers, (inaudible). So I recommend it that there be, to recognize that we have to hedge our bet here. If I could not work out an acceptable arrangement with you gentlemen, that there had to be some recognition of the realities of that modern land development and the inadequacies existing in law and some faith in the ability of the officials that you've assigned to the objective which includes the Governor's right arm, the Secretary of Policy and Management, the man who has probably done more in the State of Connecticut to help achieve sound economic development, Commission Carson, The Commissioner of Higher Education, the people from the university and who have on their board renowned private developers in the State of Connecticut. All esteemed and responsible people.

And so I felt that we needed, the legislature needed to have this brought to their attention and have to look at this thing from the point of view, how can we get something done. You know, most agencies, the things that, when you read the headlines, you know, we play a game of I gotcha, I gotcha. How can we say, how can we help you and get something done if you think this is a worthy project. So I think you need some legislation here which in effect koshers this whole (inaudible) thing in the first place. In other words, authorizes and says we recognize UCKPI as an organization and recognizes that there is going to

COMM. FREEDMAN: (continued)
be a land transaction and that the transfer is going to be for $1.00. There has been no law that has been passed on that and I think this one covers that.

I personally was happy just to have our department excluded because I think it's just one extra baggage. I didn't recommend that the Property Review Board be excluded up front, but I do think that it is important that once that lease is approved that the responsibility be given to the University of Connecticut and UCKPI to carry forth this project without hindrance, that there be some kind of reporting mechanism that be created on a monthly or quarterly basis so that there is accountability built into the system and that the concerns have been (inaudible) expressed, that you know, it'd be uncontrollable and I put it to rest.

So there may have to be some slight modification maybe to this existing bill before you to cover those things, but I do recommend and you know it's unusual for a commissioner of the state to want to give up powers, but I would say here I think we have to focus, not our turret, but on what it is that we want to get done, what is good public policy and move in that direction. So I recommend that you do give due consideration and I'd be willing to help sit down with you and your staff to help make any modifications necessary to get us off this existing law which I think it does inhibit getting something, that's my recommendation, Mr. McLaughlin.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Are there questions? Rep. Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE: Yes, you mentioned having a recording process, I think maybe monthly may be too often. Who would you suggest that that report be filed in the Property Review Board?

COMM. FREEDMAN: I think the Property Review Board is a good board to do that. I think that there may be a legislative committee as well and maybe, I really haven't given much thought to it, but I do think the Property Review Board is a qualified group to receive such reports, but I am not sure whether you might want to have some other agency as well, the auditors, for instance, or the controllers of, I'm not sure.

REP. ABERCROMBIE: If Property Review gave their blessing under

REP. ABERCROMBIE: (continued)
your plan to (inaudible) the lease to the (inaudible) master plan concept for the development, don't you think that then if there are any changes made in that that it should go back to Property Review?

COMM. FREEDMAN: Well, I think, Mr. Abercrombie, you probably send them in a direction that I think could very well be acceptable to everyone because even the UCKPI had recommended that there would be, that where the change, the master plan change that we'd require them to come back and get authorization, I think that there are some problems, that there would be limitations on time and so forth, but I think that needs to be carefully written so that we don't have a situation where we're pushing paper and (inaudible) the need had already been done and the review is really superficial. But if there's going to be a change, then there needs to be some attention to it.

REP. ABERCROMBIE: I would be supportive really of almost anything to move a project of this type along. You're aware that I've been involved in this building project, our legislative office building, and I think maybe, I think that process (inaudible) statewide basis.

COMM. FREEDMAN: I agree with you.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Rep. Savage.

REP. SAVAGE: Yes, Commissioner, we've talked about Property Review, supposing for administrative purposes we put the project under Economic Development. What would you reaction to that be, supervisional?

COMM. FREEDMAN: Rep. Savage, I really (inaudible) the Board whether it be called the Board of UCKPI or whether we establish a legislative or administrative board at the state level to supervise the project, that might be another solution. I think that we've got to look into all of the potentials. I just feel that in looking at overall state government, we're giving so much to Property Review that we may creating another bottleneck and I'm not sure that that's the agency that I would prefer to see in there.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Rep. Savage, perhaps we shouldn't accrue to that monster for ourselves. Are there further

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: (continued)
questions?

COMM. FREEDMAN: By the way, Sen. McLaughlin, with all due respect, since we're the ones getting hit over the head most by the Property Review Board, I really think they have a role --.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Well, I meant that --.

COMM. FREEDMAN: But we're only human like anybody else. They make mistakes as well, but they don't get reported on.

REP. SAVAGE: Well, let me clarify one thing, seeing how I made the statement, I, it's no slant on Properties Review. I think that basically they're doing a fine job. I just think that they've got their hands full with the amount of work that we give them at this point in time and --.

COMM. FREEDMAN: Well, I can't counter, all I can say to you is that without the Property Review Board I would be in deep trouble almost every week.

REP. SAVAGE: I know, you use them extensively, I think all state government does, but I wonder if we are overdoing it though.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Sen. Johnston.

SEN. JOHNSTON: Commissioner, by the way, I apologize for asking the question of Mr. Weaver, I didn't see you in the back of the hall, but I guess one of my concerns with the project is that this is really a different kind of a project. I think the Properties, that is to my limited knowledge of DAS and Properties Review, is that they are really designed to have a lot of accountability for state buildings, for state projects where they're building the building strictly for public use and we may not need it in six months or a year or even two or three and I know that when we went through all of the bonding, all other agencies during our Bonding Subcommittee Review, many projects have been two, three, four or five years in the process and maybe we need to look at all of those other details as we go on in a state building. But I guess my concern here is in also dealing with some industrial development in my own district is that when a business wants to build an industrial plant

SEN. JOHNSTON: (continued)
or what have you, they appear to be ready to move and when they're ready to move, we've got to expedite and rather than taking that time and developer's dollars, then the project is less financially acceptable and I guess that's my concern with having all of these reviews go through every process.

I hesitate, it makes me nervous that a developer would just say that I can't go through all that. My Board of Directors meeting approved this addition or this new plant and I'm not going to wait two years to get this done. I'm going to go look somewhere else and I think the whole technology park, as you say, is a great opportunity for Northeast Connecticut and the university and it just makes me a little nervous to have us go through some of those --.

COMM. FREEDMAN: Well, I would agree with you and I think out of the sense I get from the statements made by members of the committee is that there needs to be some kind of balance. I think there's a recognition that the existing law doesn't provide that and the issue here is, and we are willing to work with you, is to find an appropriate check and balance mechanism with due respect to getting the job which is what you're saying.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. JOHN DI BIAGGIO: Mr. Chairman, can I make a comment, (inaudible) you had no objections to modifying its makeup, to make it more responsive to requirements (inaudible).

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: John, I would respectfully welcome your comments after the hearing if I can if perhaps we could chat about that. We are going to move into the public portion of the hearing. Our first speaker is, I believe, George Whitham, oh, I'm sorry, the Alumni Association.

MR. GEORGE WHITHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I'm George Whitham from Mansfield, Connecticut and my interests in Raised Committee Bill 995 are broad and I'll make this statement very short so I don't repeat a lot of things that have and will be said.

I'm President of the University of Connecticut Alumni Association. I also wear a hat as a member of the Town

MR. WHITHAM: (continued)
Council in Mansfield and I think the important role that I'd like to play here today is that I'm a resident of Northeastern Connecticut and I'm speaking in terms of that area of the state.

I would just cut the words as Alumni President first. I think you must realize that we have an interest in this bill, a selfish interest from one standpoint because anything that enhances the university also enhances the value of our degrees and there are about 65,000 of us in the State of Connecticut who take a great deal of pride in the university. I would reiterate and not repeat what was said in the resolution that although we are interested in the university's ability to improve its program of service to the state, we are also concerned that the development of the entire State of Connecticut and the contributions that your project will make.

Previous testimony has touched on opportunities for increased employment and economic growth that can be anticipated. As a resident of Northeastern Connecticut I can only echo these comments. Although I now live in Mansfield I was privileged to live and work in Windham County, also New London County for a number of years. From firsthand observation and experience, I know that this bill will greatly enhance the area both economically and socially.

I was going to throw in a comment here that has no relation to this, but I wanted to refer to the fact that probably Sen. Johnston and I are the only two here today that know where the (inaudible) bill is. And that's (inaudible) good. But this is the type of community and things that I'm concerned about in Northeastern Connecticut, these large number of small villages and hamlets that need that economic growth and development. When this occurs there will be beneficial spinoffs for the entire state. With the growth of the research capabilities there have been increases in the development of highly trained students prepared to enter the continually expanding high tech industries in Connecticut, linkages with state business and economic opportunity will be strengthened. There will be an opportunity to attract the industries and in effect the employment unemployment ratio in the area and particularly assist Northeastern Connecticut which has a higher than average unemployment level at the present time, that's higher than the average

MR. WHITHAM: (continued)
of the state. Finally, increase our economic activity which increases payrolls and strenthens revenue of the state. And on an entirely different note, I'm privileged to serve as a Commissioner on the state Human Rights and Opportunities Commission and I think it's somewhat interesting what happens to people in the state. I would certainly support this legislation because it should increase accessibility to jobs, increase the type and level of employment that will be provided and provide all of us to strengthen our belief that we should provide opportunities of equality for all the citizens. Thank you.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Thanks, George. Are there questions? Thank you. Our next speaker is Martin Berliner, Town Manager in the Town of Mansfield.

MR. MARTIN BERLINER: Good morning. My name is Martin Berliner. I'm the Town Manager of Mansfield. I'm here today to speak in strong support of Committee Bill 995, as amended, An Act Concerning the Development of a Connecticut Technology Park at Storrs. I am also speaking on behalf of the Mansfield Town Council which has monitored the progress of this project for the past four years and it analyzed the multifacet elements of a concept master plan for the Connecticut Technology Park.

For January 1985 the Mansfield Town Council strongly endorses this project due to the significant positive impact it would have on the economic climate of Northeastern Connecticut. Construction of the Connecticut Technology Park will create a large number of diverse employment opportunties, stimilate related commercial and industrial growth in the region and enhance housing opportunities. The proposed hotel conference center will address a long standing need in the University of Connecticut. Of a fair amount of importance, this project will promote the academic and professional prestige of the University of Connecticut which, in a variety of ways, is the economic and cultural center of Northeastern Connecticut.

The Town of Mansfield has been fortunate in that the University of Connecticut and the University of Connecticution Educational Properties, Incorporated, UCEPI, the officials of both have been very careful. In additional to their private developer, the Sunrise Development Company, they have shared information with the town and regional officials and local citizens. They

MR. BERLINER: (continued)
have kept us informed of the project's status and the pending issues. Mansfield's Mayor has served on the UCEPI Board of Directors and numerous citizens from our region have served on the UCEPI Advisory Council.

The Connecticut Technology Park and its proposed site fulfill specific (inaudible) objectives for the Mansfield plan of development, the Windham Regional Planning Agency's guide plan and the State of Connecticut's conservation and development policies plan. The Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission has reviewed the concept plans for this project. In addition, the commission has spent a considerable amount of time drafting and after two public hearings adopted local zoning regulations that would authorize and regulate the multi-use research and development project.

The proposed Connecticut Technology Park is a complex project. It involves many governmental review agencies including a host of state and federal regulatory agencies as well the Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission and Inland Wetlands Agencies. In the past three years many issues regarding this project have been successfully resolved and although a number of issues remain, it is extremely important that the project move ahead at this time.

Committee Bill 995 will transfer responsibility for this project to the University of Connecticut's Board of Trustees and the UCEPI Board and allow this to happen. These organizations are well-qualified to make the important public interest decisions that remain regarding the project.

In summary, the Connecticut Technology Park will stimulate the economy of Northeast Connecticut and promotes the academic and professional prestige of the University of Connecticut. The project will be subject to the governmental review of the University of Connecticut Board of Trustees as well as federal, state and local regulatory agencies and it will be coordinated by the University of Connecticut Educational Properties, Inc.

Committee Bill 995 will expedite the construction of this project without detrimentally affecting the public interest of the State of Connecticut. For these reasons, I recommend that Committee Bill 995 be adopted. Thank you.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Thanks, Martin. Are there questions for Mr. Berliner? Thank you. Our next speaker is Frank Rich.

MR. FRANK RICH: I'm Frank Rich, Vice Chairman of the Board of Trustees and a university member on the UCEPI Board. I've been involved since the inception of the concept of creating this research park. The main thing, contribution I think I can make to your knowledge of it today is the fact that from the very beginning we recognize that the success of this park is dependent upon the entrepreneureal spirit of the developer that we would select for the job.

And it's important that that developer have preserved for him the flexibility to exert his entrepreneureal efforts to the maximum extent. The park will be a success if he's a success. We've got to do everything on our part to help him be able to accomplish his aims in the most expeditious way possible. As Commissioner Freedman said, you have to be in a position to help and that's what I think this bill is about. Thank you.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Frank, thank you. Are there questions for Mr. Rich. Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Paul Goldberg from Sunrise Development.

MR. PAUL GOLDBERG: Sen. McLaughlin, Vice Chairman Giuletti, Vice Chairman Savage, Members of the Committee, my involvement with Connecticut Technology Park dates back to November of 1982 when I represented my company in the national competition that UCEPI held to select the master developer. The selection process was concluded in May 1983 when John DiBiaggio and I signed the master developer agreement. So all told, I've been associated with the park for two and a half years and during that time my company has invested more than a half a million dollars.

While I was somewhat skeptical about the practicability of the park at the outset, those doubts have all been dispelled and I am now totally convinced that Connecticut Technology Park is a very viable undertaking and one that is extremely important to the State of Connecticut.

I'd like to adress my remarks today to two aspects of the park. One, the evolution of high tech parks throughout the country, and two, the potential for this park at UConn. The movement is less than 40 years old and it's revolutionized

MR. GOLDBERG: (continued)
in the way in which high technology companies establish their facilities. It began in 1947 at Stamford when land was made available to a young scientist named Varian to build a laboratory and a plant close to the school. Varian happened to have invented radar and he felt that there just might possibly be some commercial application for this military invention. Within months of that event, an Eastman Kodak representative on a scouting trip for a west coast site had a chance meeting with the president of Stamford who happened to think that he might have a good site for Kodak's new facility. The rest, as we say, is history.

And the Stamford research park, Silicon Valley and incidentally the rise of the real estate firm of Cushman and Wakefield all were created from those simple beginnings. A lot has happened since then with many universities trying to emulate Stamford's success. The results have been favorable. The research triangle in North Carolina is a major success story. It's 6,600 acres and now the home for 25,000 employees and the source of a $1 billion annual payroll. It's 30 years old and it's a joint venture of Duke, the University of North Carolina, and North Carolina State University, along with very strong support from the state and a major presence by IBM.

Closer to home we have, as been described to you earlier, Science Park at Yale and the massive Route 128 complex in Massachusetts which, of course, is not a park per se, but it's the result of thousands of private initiatives by firms that are compelled to be close to Harvard and MIT. Other newer success stories are Princeton's Forest Hill Park, the Balconius Research Park at the University of Texas and a recent venture of Emery University in Atlanta. Connecticut Technology Park will be located immediately adjacent to the University of Connecticut campus which will greatly facilitate direct interaction between corporate scientists, faculty members and graduate students. In this respect, it has the best locational advantage of any high tech park in the country. Physically the park will be situated in a very attractive setting, comparable with the best suburban parks. Mansfield is an appealing place to live, having the best features of an excellent public school system, a superb municipal government and all the good features of living in a college town.

MR. GOLDBERG: (continued)
Conn Tech is favored with a close working relationship between the university faculty and administration. It's also supported by the best state economic development department in the country. These are the factors that are most important to any high tech company choosing a site for a new facility and I know that contact, once established, will be a great success.

Nevertheless one cannot lose sight of the fact that this venture, like all the others, is a business. And to be in business one must be competitive. One factor that is most important in making a sale, it's more important than price and it's second only to location is the speed at which the developer can deliver a site to a prospective customer. Frequently companies, even Fortune 500 companies, come up with a custom facility requirement that has to be met in just 90 or 120 days. We can met those schedules and we've done it in the past, but we can't do it if every transaction has to be scrutinized and modified and approved by several state agencies. It simply won't work and neither I nor any other competent developer will try to make it work.

What's needed, as you know, is simple authorization to execute the lease to UCEPI and then trust the operation of the park to the UCEPI directors. You know many of the directors personally. They're extremely competent. They're represented by very able counsel. What UCEPI, the Town of Mansfield and other state agencies have all done is set very high performance standards for context developers. We, developers have agreed to abide by those stringent standards.

Please note that UCEPI's concerns are the same as your concerns, enhancement of the State of Connecticut as a home for high technology companies, advancement of the University of Connecticut through interaction with private industrial companies, growth of employment and business activity in the university's home region which is Eastern Connecticut, development of an attractive physical plant all paid for with private funds and creation of a long term economic resource. All of this can be done, but I urge you to act expeditiously. The state has already lost two major tenants because I could not meet their time horizons and those opportunities are gone forever. New York, New Jersy, and Massachusetts are all ahead of us. Even New Hampshire is

MR. GOLDBERG: (continued)
making significant progress in this field. As soon as we can, let's convince that they'll live in the very best high technology park in the country and insure Connecticut's leadership well into the future. Thank you very much.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Paul, thank you. Are there questions for Mr. Goldberg? Thank you. Our next speaker is Bob Mulready, the Town Manager in the Town of Enfield.

MR. BOB MULREADY: My name is Robert Mulready. I'm the Town Manager of Enfield. I'm here to testify on behalf of the Mayor and the Town Council regarding LCO No. 5696 which is a waiver of interest on motor vehicle delinquent taxes after five years. I'll give you a brief history, and I will be brief, on taxes and (inaudible) in Enfield in the past few years. I was hired as Town Manager in February of 1983 --.

SEN. MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Mulready, may I excuse you, I believe that you're speaking to House Bill 7875.

MR. MULREADY: Very good. Thank you. The brief history goes back in February of 1983 when the main assignment I was given when I was hired as Town Manager was to incrue the collection of delinquent taxes. For the three years prior to my arriving there from FY80 through FY82 the town collected $1,365,197. During the past three fiscal years to include this projected through June we will collect $2,292,276 or an increase over the last three years of $927,000 plus for a 68% increase in collection rates. The current system of collecting both current and delinquent taxes is very good. We have a very fine computer system. The problem or the concern we have is that the system for 1970 through 1979 was very inadequate. It was a hand system and delinquent notices were not being sent on a regular basis. As a matter of fact, there was only evidence that they were sent once during that entire time period.

The problem that's facing us is there are still many accounts that are delinquent and many of the people do still live town are in (inaudible) motor vehicle tax. When we reviewed this to try to put this out on the suspense list I couldn't in conscience recommend to the Town Council that we ignore these people despite of the fact some of them may have owed it for 13, 14 years and never received a delinquent notice from the town. The solution we believe is the town should