

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 128	PA 399	1987
House 9973 - 9984		12
Senate 3323 - 3332, 3384 - 3485		12
Appropriations 1311, 1319, 1328, 1355 1356 - 1360		9
		33

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

H-476

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1987

VOL. 30  
PART 27  
9787-10158

abs

562

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

to the Senate of all items requiring Senate action.  
Is there objection? Is there objection? Is there  
objection? Seeing no objection, the rules are sus-  
pended for that purpose.

CLERK:

Calendar 868 on page 16. Substitute for Senate  
Bill 1180, AN ACT CREATING THE JOHN DEMPSEY HOSPITAL  
FINANCE CORPORATION. (As amended by Senate "A").

Favorable Report of the Committee on PUBLIC HEALTH.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Balducci.

REP. BALDUCCI: (27th)

Mr. Speaker, may that item be referred to the  
Committee on Finance?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Motion is to refer to the Committee on Finance.  
Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing no  
objection, the bill is referred to the Committee on  
Finance.

CLERK:

Calendar 869, Substitute for Senate Bill 128,  
AN ACT REVISING STATE GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON

abs

563

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

STATE-OWNED PROPERTY SO THAT SUCH GRANTS ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO PROPERTY TAXES THAT WOULD BE PAID ON SUCH PROPERTY IF SUBJECT TO TAX. (As amended by Senate "A").  
Favorable Report of the Committee on APPROPRIATIONS.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

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

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill essentially scrapes the existing state pilot grant program for state-owned properties and replaces it with a straight reimbursement based on 20% of the actual tax levy that would have been collected. It increases the minimum grant to \$4,000 and puts the cap at 7½% of the total tax levied by the municipality in the preceeding calendar year as

abs

564

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

a cap on the actual state grant.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an, a clarifying amendment, Senate "A". LCO 7857. I would ask that he call, and that I be permitted to summarize.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Clerk has an amendment, LCO 7851,....

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker... 7851.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Senate "A". Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

LCO 7851, designated Senate "A", offered by

Senator Harper.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker, the amendment clears up the language in the hold harmless by saying that the grant will be no less than the grant that would have been applicable had no changes in the formula taken place, the grant would be based on... the grant that would have been

abs

565

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

calculated for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1987.

I would urge adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark? If not, all those in favor of the amendment, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

All those to the contrary, nay.

The amendment is adopted, ruled technical.

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Just very briefly, the fiscal note indicates the actual grant level for each municipality in the State. It represents an increase in funding for State pilots for in excess of three million dollars. I would urge.... actually 3.6 million dollars,

abs

566

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

I would urge passage of the bill. Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 7895. If the Clerk would please call, and I be permitted to summarize.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Clerk has an amendment, LCO 7895, House "A". Will the Clerk please call?

CLERK:

LCO 7895, designated House "A", offered by Representative Ward.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Chamber, what this amendment does is indicate that property owned by the Southcentral Connecticut Regional

abs

567

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

Water Authority that is not otherwise subject to payments in lieu of taxes would be designated as state-owned property so that it would fit within the reimbursement levels of the file copy.

And I move adoption.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Southcentral Connecticut Regional Water Authority is exactly what it sounds like, a regional water authority. Much of the property owned by that water authority is subject to payments in lieu of taxes that the Water Authority pays.

However, certain structures built after 1978 are not subject to any reimbursement level whatsoever, so that whatever community happens to have that property, they suffer the full loss, the 100% loss of taxable

abs

568

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

revenue and if that community in effect then underwrites the water that is provided for all of the other communities.

One community in particular that is fairly severely impacted, which is the town of North Branford, as a result of a multi-million dollar, some 28 million dollar treatment plant that is not on the Grand List, that would otherwise be on the Grand List, were it not for a Special Act back in 1978. That treatment plant serves all of Southcentral Connecticut, and not just in fact... barely serves North Branford at all.

I think, if we look at all of what our pilot payments do, what they do is reimburse the community when that community has some property that benefits the state at large or a region at large. So, this fits within the general contents of pilot payments, and I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

abs

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

Representative Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker, I admire the gentleman for his persistence and his consistency, but I don't have a fiscal note. Just out of curiosity, through you, Mr. Speaker, before I say no... could we have some idea of what the revenue impact would be?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will answer a question with a question. Is the gentleman asking for a fiscal note or asking for my opinion of the estimate?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am asking for a fiscal note. As per our rules, we ought to have one.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The request is for a fiscal note. Do you have one?

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

I assumed there would be one.

abs

570

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker, I assumed there would be one, as well, because I have had the amendment since early this morning, but I do not, in fact, have a fiscal note back from Fiscal Analysis.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Smoko.

REP. SMOKO: (91st)

Mr. Speaker, being somewhat a purist on matters of this nature, I would have to say that this amendment is not properly before us for want of a fiscal note, and I would advise the Chair that that is my feeling on it, and I would ask for a ruling of the Chair, based on that premise.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Before making a ruling, I will call on Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker. I agree that the rules say there should be a fiscal note. I wish I had had one by now.

abs

561

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

I guess I will have to look for another vehicle. I don't wish to put the Chamber through a Point of Order on this.

I agree we should follow the rules strictly. If I had been able to prepare the fiscal note, I would have. At this time, I would ask permission to withdraw the amendment.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Ward has asked to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection? Let me state this now to Representative Ward and to all the members. During the final days of the session, there is a crunch on LCO and OFA. If members are getting in a request in a timely fashion... I am informed that Representative Ward did have this request in early this morning... if you could touch base with either myself or the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader, wherever appropriate, perhaps we can help push these things up on the agenda if they are important to any member of this Chamber on either side of the aisle.

We do apologize. It is hard for them to deal with all requests that are flowing at this time.

abs

562

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

Thank you very much for your consideration, Representative Ward.

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? If not, will members please be seated? Staff and guests, to the Well of the House. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is currently voting by roll call. Members, please report to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members, to the Chamber, please.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, ... if all the members have voted...

The machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will Clerk please announce the tally?

abs

563

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 26, 1987

CLERK:

Senate Bill 128, as amended by Senate "A",  
in concurrence.

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	8

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The bill, as amended, is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar 870, Substitute for Senate Bill 186.

AN ACT PROVIDING FUNDS FOR A GRANT TO THE GREATER  
HARTFORD SENIOR CITIZENS COUNCIL, INC., FOR THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF A PILOT SENIOR CRAFTSMAN STORE.  
Favorable Report of the Committee on APPROPRIATIONS.

REP. BROUILLET: (3rd)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The distinguished Vice-Chairman of the  
Appropriations Committee, Representative Arthur  
Brouillet.

S-270

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1987

VOL. 30  
PART 9  
3074-3398

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

251 3323  
tcc

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this bill does is clarify the ability of the State Retirement Commission to collect overpayments of disability awards that are retroactive in nature. Under current law there is not any provision to prevent double payment where a person has been placed on retirement disability and subsequently receives a retroactive disability award from Workers' Compensation and this enables the Retirement Division to make collection under those circumstances.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? Senator Spellman,

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

If there is no objection, Mr. President, I would ask that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 636, File 955, Substitute for Senate Bill 128,  
AN ACT REVISING STATE GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON STATE-  
OWNED PROPERTY SO THAT SUCH GRANTS ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO  
PROPERTY TAXES THAT WOULD BE PAID ON SUCH PROPERTY IF SUBJECT  
TO TAX. Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

252 3324  
tcc

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 7851. Would the Clerk please call and may I -- would the reading be waived and may I be permitted to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Clerk please call the amendment?

THE CLERK:

LCO 7851, designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Senator Harper of the 6th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Since the file copy of the bill will establish a whole harmless provision for towns receiving state pilot money for state properties, the amendment is needed so that the base is used to determine the whole harmless includes additional money that was in the account this year that we distributed -- will be distributed on a prorated basis as per a piece of legislation that we passed, I believe.

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

253 3325  
tcc

last week and that's what the amendment does. It makes a date change so that that additional money in the state pilot account would be calculated in the base to determine the whole harmless. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

THE CLERK:

LCO 7567, designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B" offered by Senator Smith of the 8th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith. That's 7567.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment and request permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, you may proceed.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Sir. This amendment is one in which we

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

254 3326  
tcc

are recognizing the need to preserve open space and farmland, much as we are preserving hospitals and universities throughout the State of Connecticut through tax relief offered to those communities in which these facilities are located. We're asking that the State of Connecticut, with its broader tax base, reimburse communities to a level of 40% of the assessed taxation of lands classified as farmland and forestland. I would move the amendment and urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Yes, through you, Mr. President, a question to Senator Smith.

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed.

SENATOR HARPER:

I am not in possession of a fiscal note on this bill, so I would either like to see a fiscal note or perhaps, through you, Senator Smith, would tell me how the expansion of this payment in lieu of taxes program would be funded.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, inasmuch as there is no fiscal note

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

255 3327  
tcc

because the effective date is July 1, 1988.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Senator Smith. I would urge defeat of the amendment. There obviously will be a fiscal impact at some time. It seems we don't know how much it would be and I think if this item is to be considered, I would personally prefer that it go through the normal appropriations process which it has not been through and I just don't think it's good to obligate the state in the fiscal year subsequent to the one in which we are appropriating money for without knowing what that cost would be and even if we did know what that cost would be, again, this is an item I think of great significance and we should have time to fully hear it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. There isn't a fiscal note because it does not go into effect of July of 1988, but if you read the amendment, the amendment basically says that the monies available will be used on a prorated basis

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

256 3328  
tcc

and that if, in fact, no monies were appropriated by the General Assembly, no money would be distributed. I happen to think that this concept is serious enough and is important enough that we should give it the consideration that it deserves and we should do it now, not wait another year because it would take approximately a year for everything to be put in place, that is, the assessment dates of the communities are such that they would need the lead time and that if in fact, Senator Harper, in the consideration of the 1988-89 budget there was a determination that this does not reach a high enough priority level to be included within the budget that's brought forth, the decision could be made at that time, but we will have at least had the opportunity to address the concept, put the concept in place so that when the State of Connecticut and the people within the state recognize exactly what it is that we have to offer, I'm sure that a number of us will be contacted by our constituencies most of which would be very supportive of programs that would encourage the preservation of open space and farmland and I think would be more than willing to have the state as a state policy absorb some of that cost as opposed to having a number of small municipalities absorb it for the entire state. Roll call, please.

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

257 3329  
tcc

THE CHAIR:

A roll call has been requested and noted. Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just like to clarify a point. Senator Smith is saying -- I think he's saying that this doesn't necessarily cost money because depending on whatever the appropriation is, it says that funds would be distributed on a prorated basis, but the point should be made that let's say in 1988-89 the Appropriations Committee did not change the level of funding because you're expanding the program in terms of the amount of properties and the number of towns that you would give the state pilot out to. Obviously, towns that are currently receiving state pilot and those who would get a particular allocation in 1987-88 that they will have built into their local budgets, well, obviously, they get less, so in order to keep everybody at the same, at the very least, at the same amount they were getting under this grant and to address the new requirements of the amendment, we'd obviously be forced to appropriate additional money, and again, I'm not prepared to endorse that policy at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? Senator McLaughlin.

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

258  
CC 3330

SENATOR McLAUGHLIN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to embrace the, and endorse and urge the adoption of this amendment. Conceptually, I would hope this would not be included in the seductive category. I would hope that it would cause us to pause and attempt to understand the doctrine of the payment in lieu of taxes program and the principle of reimbursement to our municipalities for foregone revenue, foregone revenue that might have been realized because of a state policy put upon those municipal revenues.

We recognize that with hospitals and universities and we recognize that with state property. I think the payment in lieu of taxes for those foregone revenues that are lost from the Grand List because of lots that are as unimproved, taken off the Grand List, is a fair one. Indeed, it was the proposal that was first suggested earlier this year by a leader in the House, Representative Bertinuson, and I believe it is a principle that has to be reviewed. Senator Smith I think has an idea which has to be examined and I think it's a fair amendment and I would urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks on the amendment? The Clerk please

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

259  
tcc 3331

make an announcement for an immediate roll call.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

The question before the Chamber is a motion to adopt  
Amendment Schedule "B", LCO No. 7567. The machine is  
open, please record your vote.

Senator O'Leary, Senator Owens, Senator Truglia. Has  
everyone voted. The machine is closed. The Clerk please  
tally the vote.

The result of the vote:

10 Yea

23 Nay

The amendment is defeated. Further amendments?

THE CLERK:

No further amendments, Mr. President, Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Speaking on the bill  
as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", the bill would  
change the formula used to pay the payment in lieu of taxes

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

260 3332  
tcc

grant on state-owned property from a formula which was based on the proportion of a municipality's tax levy to the total state tax levy to a new formula which will pay a fixed 20% reimbursement on the tax loss. The new 20% formula also provides for a \$4,000 minimum grant, a whole harmless provision and a cap at 7½% of the total tax levied by the municipality in the preceding Calendar year.

I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks on the bill. Senator Harper.

SENATOR HARPER:

If there's no comments, I would move the item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Returning to Calendar Page 2, Favorable Reports, Calendar 221, File 265, Substitute for Senate Bill 1040, AN ACT CONCERNING CERTIFICATION BY THE MUNICIPAL POLICE TRAINING COUNCIL. Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Herbst.

S-270

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1987

VOL. 30  
PART 9  
3074-3398

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

312  
tcc **3384**

Substitute for Senate Bill 249; Calendar No. 590, Substitute  
for Senate Bill 414; Calendar Page 10, Calendar 594,  
Substitute for Senate Bill 951; Calendar 595, Senate Bill  
889; Calendar 596, Substitute for Senate Bill 946;  
Calendar 597, Substitute for Senate Bill 925; Calendar Page  
11, Calendar 601, Substitute for Senate Bill 1001; Calendar  
602, Substitute --.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

SB1019  
Calendar 602, I'd like to have removed from the  
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 12, Calendar No. 607, Substitute for  
Senate Bill 5074; Calendar Page 13, Calendar 613, Substitute  
for House Bill 7588; Calendar 615, Substitute for House  
Bill 7222; Calendar Page 14, Calendar 623, Substitute  
for House Bill 5758; Calendar 624, House Bill 6969; Page 15,  
Calendar 632, House Bill 6681; Calendar 634, House Bill  
7615; Calendar 636, Substitute for Senate Bill 128. That

WEDNESDAY  
MAY 20, 1987

313 3385  
tcc

concludes the third Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Any corrections, additions or deletions? If not, we're voting on the Consent Calendar. The machine is opened. Please cast your vote. The machine is closed. The Clerk please take the tally.

The result of the vote:

35 Yea

0 No

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Senator O'Leary.

Item 602 is --.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Item 602 was taken off of Consent. Do we want to vote that no, Mr. President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator, would you like to suspend the rules first or was that your intention?

SENATOR O'LEARY:

That will be my intention, Mr. President, when we -- if you want when we reach the last item we'll suspend for all items.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk please announce an immediate roll call.

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

APPROPRIATIONS  
PART 4  
1039-1377

1987

SEN. HARPER: (continued)

What we will try to do is, if we have not finished the town officials and it appears there's at least a sheet and a half, we will have to hold off at that time and take other people signed up under the public portion.

Unless there are so few people signed up and they don't mind waiting. We'll play it by ear when we get to noon.

I would ask that the various selectmen, mayors, town managers, and CCM officials try to keep individual testimonies to about three minutes so we can move through this as expeditiously as possible.

Payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT)  
And I want to just caution everybody again with particular bills that I know you're interested in primarily SB 105, SB 128, and SB 575, address increases in aid in specific monetary amounts.

I want to make a disclaimer, simply because these bills have the sponsorship of several chairmen of major committees of the Legislature, it should not be implied that there is agreement on the specifics in the bills currently before you.

Decisions on increases in the several pilots that are being heard this session, and increases in any other type of financial aid, the final decisions are yet to be made. And I don't want anybody to believe that because you see something before you today that there has been an agreement on that amount.

With that, let us begin with Mr. Joel Cogen of CCM and Steve Cassano, President of the CCM.

STEPHEN CASSANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Stephen Cassano. I'm President of Connecticut Conference of Municipalities. With me is Joel Cogen, Executive Director of the Conference of Municipalities.

MR. CASSANO: (Cont.)

is not what is should be. We are feeling a significant impact on a local level with federal cutbacks. Why on the one hand we're cutting services. There is discussion on cutting taxes, we don't have that luxury, we are going to increase taxes. I know that that is going to happen in my community and I assume in every one of these communities here. And as the Representative who spoke earlier mentioned his mil rate is going up 9 mils, so that I don't think we are just here without reason, I think there is legitimate cause as to our presentation.

SEN. MCLAUGHLIN: Steve, I don't mean to get into a back and forth with you, but I agree that there is a partnership. You (inaudible interruption). I'm not hearing any solutions.

SEN. HARPER: We are going to have to move along. Thank you gentlemen. The Honorable Mayor of the City of New Haven, Biaggio Dilieto followed by the Honorable Mayor of the City of Bridgeport, Thomas Bucci.

Mayor, we are going to have to limit testimony to three minutes. We have a very long list of speakers at this point.

MAYOR DILIEITO: I'll do the very best I can. As Mayor of the City of New Haven I am here to urge passage of Senate Bill 105, an act which will increase the payment in lieu of taxes on tax-exempt real property of private colleges and general hospitals and Senate Bill 128, an act providing additional state funds for property tax relief.

Regarding the pilot for colleges and hospitals, I would point out that New Haven is the location of four such tax-exempt institutions; Yale New Haven Hospital, The Hospital of St. Raphael's, Yale University and Albertus Magnus College. Collectively, the property of these institutions represent a real restate tax loss of an estimated \$21.5 million and personal property tax loss of an estimated \$5 million. The estimated tax loss to the city of New Haven which can be directly attributed to the four institutions

MAYOR SANTOPIETRO: (Cont.)

this time.

REP. POLINSKY: You were earlier on.

REP. MIGLIARO: Point of order.

SEN. HARPER: Thank you all. Mr. Robert Mulready, Town Manager of Enfield followed by the Honorable Mayor Barbara Weinberg of Manchester.

MR. MULREADY: Senator Harper, Representative Polinsky, Members of the Appropriations Committee, my name is Robert Mulready and I'm the Town Manager, Chief Executive Officer of the Town of Enfield. I am here to testify in favor of Senate Bill 128 regarding property tax relief. Municipalities throughout Connecticut are clearly over relying on the property tax to meet the needs of our citizens. During recent years, the Federal Government has abandoned its commitment to local government. While the State of Connecticut has assisted in abating this loss, most cities and towns are forced to raise taxes year after year. Last year, the legislature and the Governor gave us funds under the municipal infrastructure trust fund for roads, and the town improvement program for capital projects. These programs are not included in the Governor's budget, but instead, he has proposed the new property tax relief program.

This new program would give Enfield less funds than we received in the current year under the existing programs. Enfield has raised taxes in 8 of the last 10 years, and the proposed budget by fiscal year 87-88 will also call for a tax increase which I will bring before the Council tonight. I am here, on behalf of the Mayor and Town Council and our respective citizens to request additional assistance to help us ease the property tax burden.

Additionally, I would urge your favorable review on the proposed Senate Bill 575 for payment-in-lieu of taxes. Currently, Enfield, Somers, Cheshire and Niantic house the State's prison population, primarily Enfield and Somers. It is always easier to attract

MS. CLEMENTS: (continued)

ass. #5

We are ranked 49th in the state for population, but we are ranked 9th in the state in terms of our welfare roll.

Human Services represent 25% of our town's budget. The Education Enhancement Act has produced an education budget in our town which will increase our mill rate this year in spite of the added funding.

The loss of the infrastructure funds will stop needed renovation of buildings, sidewalk repair, and construction which had been delayed for many years and we had just begun.

The Town of Windham is going to benefit from the property tax relief fund, but the City of Willimantic will benefit more by the pilot project - pilot programs which you are hearing today.

The City of Willimantic is most heavily impacted by the Fair Labor Standards Act in terms of its effect on police and fire protection. The city was looking at a millage rate increase of 4 mills this year, increase of 7.5% in taxes after last year's excess of 10%.

We urge you to give us added property tax relief, particularly through the bills 105, 128, and 575 which you're hearing today, to give Windham particularly the center of Windham, namely Willimantic, the needed aid at this time.

Thank you.

SEN. HARPER: Thank you. Any questions? The Honorable Deputy Mayor, City of Hartford, Al Marotta will be followed by Mr. John Weichsel, Town Manager of Southington.

ALPHONSE MAROTTA: Good afternoon, Senator Harper, Representative Polinsky, Members of the Appropriations Committee.

My name is Alphonse S. Marotta, I am Deputy Mayor of the City of Hartford.

This morning - my text says this morning - but this is afternoon. I won't need that now.

The City of Hartford, as you're well aware, is in support of Senate Bill 105, An Act Increasing Payments In Lieu Of Taxes, the Pilot Program, for exempt property of private colleges and general hospitals.

But the City of Hartford as the capitol of our state is burdened with a disproportionate amount of state-owned, tax exempt property. And also has a burden of private colleges and hospitals that have placed an unfair and extreme burden on the residential taxpayers of our city.

The State of Connecticut which right now is enjoying a surplus, where the City of Hartford is the fourth poorest city in the nation.

We would like you to consider not only an improvement in the pilot, but also the City of Hartford supports SB 128, An Act Providing Additional State Funds For Property Tax Relief Grants and Proposed SB 575, An Act Concerning Payment In Lieu Of Taxes for State Owned Property and SB 1012, An Act Concerning Additional State Payments in Lieu of Taxes on State-Owned Real Property for the Year 1987.

The facts that I want to bring to you today is in the City of Hartford, the State of Connecticut owned property assessed value as of 10/1/1986 would be \$131 million dollars. And the taxes at our present mill rate of 72.9, which is the highest in the state of Connecticut, would mean that we would get that amount of money in taxes on that assessment valued property.

We receive from the State of Connecticut through

MR. MAROTTA: (continued)

current PILOT \$4.1 million. In other words we are in arrears over \$6 million, this is only on state owned property, hospitals. In the city of Hartford we have three major hospitals that are exempt. Their total property value is \$120.6 million. The taxes that should be brought in for this property would be \$8.8 million. We receive in lieu of taxes \$4.7 for this the hospitals and the colleges, and the colleges of our city the property value is \$77.3 million. And the taxes that would have been attracted to our city would have been \$5.6 million.

So the total would be \$357.3 million for the assessment value of the properties that are exempt totally and we have inherited taxes of \$26 million, and if you're on a regular tax roll, and all we get from the state of Connecticut \$8.8 million. So we're at a great disadvantage. And excluding from the state property, exclude \$3.8 million excluded from the formula used for repayment to all cities and towns because it's used for highway rights of ways and highway purposes.

So, we're asking this committee really Hartford being the capitol of our state, and we believe it is the greatest state in our country. That you have been in the past very open in considering the plight of Hartford who has many, many problems. Problems that are cast on us from surrounding cities and towns. And being the capitol and being a large city we do have a real difficult problem.

And so we're asking you today because you're enjoying a surplus to try to help your capitol city, the capitol city of Connecticut, Hartford, and we're asking that also you consider a bill to add which they consider a mental institution or the Hartford Retreat. Their property is valued at \$18.2 million and the taxes to be brought in from this if it was taxes would be \$1.3 million. Currently we receive no reimbursement from the state under the PILOT program for the Institute of Living because it is not classified as a general hospital.

MR. MAROTTA: (continued)

Yet the city of Hartford has to provide services to all these institutions. Not only do we have to maintain security and fire protection, we also have to maintain the roads around the area and also have to provide them services which we are not being reimbursed. What we're asking that you do, we will be considering a bill that would put an appropriate amount of taxes on an institution such as the Institute of Living in Hartford.

And if you take and note, these hospitals continue to buy additional properties. Just this last week the Institute of Living bought a couple of pieces of property in a neighborhood and took it off the tax rolls at \$188,000 apiece. So this continues, so we need your help and thank you for giving me this time this afternoon.

SEN. HARPER: Thank you Al, any questions?

MR. MAROTTA: I've got some testimony I'd like to leave with members of the Committee.

SEN. HARPER: Okay.

SEN. SULLIVAN: I have a quick question.

SEN. HARPER: Senator Sullivan.

SEN. SULLIVAN: Mr. Mayor, I want to ask the mayor because I've known him for a long time.

MR. MAROTTA: I know.

SEN. SULLIVAN: Uh, last year over this year as far as projected increase in aid to the city of Hartford, what is going to be the differential from point A to point B?

MR. MAROTTA: Senator, most of the projected increases would be in the area of education, and the Education Encampment Act, the GTB, and all that money is

MR. MAROTTA: (continued)

allocated to education, we don't take any of it away. In the last 5 years I've been on the Council we've allocated all that money and then additional monies to the Board of Ed. This year, Senator, if you look at our budget, current budget in the city of Hartford is \$270 million. Of that \$270 million, we've allocated \$97 million directly to the Board of Ed, and also out of that we take another \$21 million for insurance, that's indirect cost to the Board of Ed that we keep in our capitol budget, okay for the Board of Ed.

So you'll see by those figures that uh, what is being proposed is an increase for the city of Hartford, but the manager is still projecting a mill increase, not only with the deferential phase in, a mill increase of maybe 5-6 mill increase for the taxpayers in Hartford.

SEN. SULLIVAN: We would agree, would we not that the municipal trust fund infrastructure or property relief trust fund our education grants all impinge upon the property tax per se. Okay. Senator McLaughlin has a question.

SEN. MCLAUGHLIN: Al, I'm glad you're here. Could you respond maybe perhaps in a simple yes or no response, if the option were provided to the city of Hartford for other than property tax revenue sources, could you support that, and do you think members of your Council could support that?

MR. MAROTTA: Senator, you're referring to a tax on people that live outside of the city that come into the city or some other sources...

SEN. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm referring to a number of sources..

MR. MAROTTA: The city Council two years ago looked at revenue sources that we would tap but we're told by our corporation council that it was illegal at that time and we are limited in the methods and ways we can raise revenue .

SEN. MCLAUGHLIN: The thing is there could be support for that.

MR. MAROTTA: There could be support, depending on what you're proposing.

SEN. HARPER: Anyone else? Thank you Al. John Weichsel.

MR. WEICHSEL: Senator Harper, Representative Polinsky and members of the Committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you. Chairman Meade had big corporate people come in from across the waters and he could not be here. I'm here on behalf of Mr. Meade and the nine members of the council, and I'm on the Board of Directors of CCM and I'm here in that capacity.

SEN. HARPER: What town?

MR. WEICHSEL: Town of Southington represented ably by Mr. Fusco from the 81st District and five other people in this distinguished body.

Uh, first of all let me speak as one member. I'll say publically what I said privately and Mr. Polinsky's comments were well taken. We try to generate people to come here, we do not write speeches for them, we do not control them and sometimes a person goes a little overboard. I personally apologize for some intemperate discussion that we heard earlier in the day. In any event that's just a personal (inaudible).

I think we're at the point where a few anecdotes town by town is what you're hearing and I think that may be constructive in this case because our universe is only 169 towns. Uh, my story is pretty much the same as what you've heard.

The main thrust of the state grant program has moved over to the educational side. Without debating the wisdom of that, that is a fact of life. We're going to receive in the next budget \$3 million for the Educational Enhancement Act, and in normal times, to