

SA13-23

HB6672

Government Admin. & Elections	1670-1671, 1742-1743, 1759-1768, 1794-1801, 1837-1840, 1843-1848, 1854-1855, 1864-1869, 2025-2032, 2035-2081	95
House	10595-10599	5
Senate	5420-5423, 5438-5439	6
		106

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS
PART 5
1351 - 1698**

2013

Senator Joe Markley.

REP. MILLER: Good afternoon, Representative Jutila, Senator Musto, and leadership and members of Public Health. Phil Miller, State Representative for the 36th District here to testify in support of two sections of 6672, the Conveyance Act.

Section 6 would give easement to the Department of Energy and Environment Protection of the area uphill of Connecticut Valley Hospital which contains several reservoirs. Local conservationists have long desired that this arrangement be made for the long-term strategic placement of these resources. This is good if these reservoirs sit on top of a very extensive aquifer that may have even more future use. And the City of Middletown would like to see this happen as well. And it's a really good bet.

The second section is Section 10 which would formally close the ill-fated Haddam Land Swamp of two years ago. This deal caused a lot of unrest and resentment because it was seen as having somehow bypassed local scrutiny. The proponent, fortunately, had included a circuit breaker which nullified the deal when independent appraisals subsequently revealed a large disparity and value. But it has been seen by some as sort of twisting in the wind with no expiration date. And this would take care of that.

And, so, I ask your careful consideration of these two. And I'd be glad to answer any questions. Thank you.

REP. JUTILA: Thank you, Representative Miller for your testimony. Questions from members of the

79

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

Committee?

Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER: It will be very quick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to thank you for your support of Section 6. I walked that area -- I hiked that area just yesterday. It's absolutely gorgeous and, hopefully, we'll get that through. Thank you.

REP. MILLER: Thank you very much.

REP. JUTILA: Are there any other questions? If not, thank you, Representative. And you can get back to your other important committee work now.

REP. MILLER: Thank you very much.

REP. JUTILA: The next speaker is Miles Rapoport followed by Senator Markley.

MILES RAPOPORT: Good afternoon. (Inaudible). Members of the Committee, my name is Miles Rapoport. I had the privilege on serving on this committee for 10 years between 1985 and 1994 and working closely with the Committee during my tenure as Secretary of the State from 1995 to 1998. So, it's a special pleasure for me to be here with my old home and with my old friends.

It's especially heartening to be here because, actually, I think Connecticut has been a real beacon on issues that concern democracy and has adopted a number of pieces of legislation over the last few years from Election Day registration to public financing of elections and others that have really made Connecticut one of the places that, at least, as a national

SB1146

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS
PART 6
1699 - 2087**

2013

150

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

REP. JUTILA: Questions from other members of the committee?

Thank you or your testimony.

JIM SMITH: Thank you.

REP. JUTILA: The next speaker is Mike Turner followed by Jan Van Tassel and Mayor Tim O'Brien.

MIKE TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Mike Turner. I'm the public work director and town engineer for the Town of Wethersfield, and I'm here asking for your support for section 1 of Bill Number 6672, which is your conveyance bill.

In particular, this section 1 addresses or I'll say corrects an issue that was brought up by a previous special act. The Town of Wethersfield participated in a DOT project that was completed in 2008 that involved 17 different land transfers. Some of them to and from the State of Connecticut. Some of those parcels of land, two, in particular, were intended to go to a private party in which we understand the State cannot convey that in a DOT project directly to the private party. So the intent was to go through the Town to the private party. But the special act contained your typical reversion clause wherein the Town could not convey that land out. We'd have to -- anything attempting to do so would go back -- the land would go back to the State so we're asking that that reversion clause be lifted in this particular case.

That's the only way the DOT and the Town can complete this project.

151

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

REP. JUTILA: Okay. Sounds straightforward enough.
Thank you.

Questions from members of the committee?

Thank you for your testimony.

MIKE TURNER: Thank you very much.

REP. JUTILA: Next speaker is Jan Van Tassel
followed by Mayor Tim O'Brien and Sal Luciano.

No? Then we go to the Mayor. The Mayor's not
here either?

Okay. Sal Luciano.

SAL LUCIANO: Thank you. My name is Sal Luciano,
one of three co-chairs of the Connecticut
Working Families Party, and I am testifying in
opposition to Senate Bill 1146, AN ACT
CONCERNING CROSS ENDORSEMENTS.

Senator Musto, Representative Jutila and the
members of the Government Administration and
Elections Committee, thank you for the
opportunity to testify on this legislation
today.

The Working Families Party was created because
the distribution of wealth has and continues to
flow, for four decades now, from working people
to the wealthy. The Working Families Party is
an independent grassroots political party that
formed in 2002 to fight for economic justice
for working and middle class families. While
we often share priorities with politicians from
the two major parties, having our own party is
the best way to advance our agenda and connect
with our members and politics. Our party has

167

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: Well, that's the practical answer. I think the policy question that I asked was does CBIA have an opinion on, will this proposed regulation effectively shut down some communications by organizations because of the disclosure requirements that's being requested, as opposed to some other method of disclosure which is currently used in the campaign process whereby it's a periodic recording and reporting of activity by a particular organization?

JENNIFER HERZ: Right. I think that is the concern is that requiring the source and amount of due payments will have a significant impact on organizations and how they choose to use their funds.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. JUTILA: Are there any other questions from members of the committee?

None, thank you for your testimony.

JENNIFER HERZ: Thank you.

REP. JUTILA: The next to testify is Representative O'Neill followed by Steve Anderson, then Michael Brandi.

REP. O'NEILL: Good afternoon. First off, I want to thank you for including in Raised Bill 6672 section 8 which relates to a transfer of a portion of land from the State of Connecticut to the Town of Southbury. The purpose for this proposed transfer is to provide land to the Southbury Senior Housing Agency that is looking

for land upon which to create new senior housing for the Town of Southbury. This transfer would be very important to the Town of Southbury because, as you may know, Southbury has a higher concentration of senior citizens than any other town in the state of Connecticut; that is, people over the age of 65. And there is relatively little low-cost and almost no subsidized housing in the Town of Southbury other than the senior housing that has already been built. We have a complex of around 100 units called Grace Meadows, and I believe that this is about the only place that seniors of limited income can look forward to going to in the Town of Southbury, and we have a very extensive waiting list so they're looking for a place to build additional land -- additional housing.

In order to apply for the federal grants and loans and that sort of thing that would be necessary for facilitate the creation of this housing, they need to identify a place to have the housing be built. And the place that they've come up with that seems to make the most sense for the community is this little parcel of land on Southbury Training School's grounds. It is not part of the farmland which is being discussed in the Environment Committee in an effort to preserve that farmland. This is a portion of land that has never been used for farming and was used at one time or another for purposes of Department of Developmental Disabilities at Southbury Training School.

It includes, all or part, I'm not quite sure, of what is known as Personnel Village. For anyone who might be familiar with the training school, which used to be a classic 1950's type suburban development of small houses on a cul-de-sac type of road that was used by the

personnel who lived at Southbury Training School because they couldn't find housing readily accessible in those days, Southbury being an extremely small town.

And it has been subsequently used for residents of Southbury Training School, the clients, and it is my understanding, in speaking with the Department, that they have a plan to eventually stop using the Personnel Village altogether. And they're, actually, not too far away from reaching that goal. But they haven't quite reached it, as yet. So one of the things that I was hoping was that if this bill -- this section goes forward with the bill that there be a recognition that availability isn't quite there yet and that some sort of provision be included that would say that if the Commissioner gets to the point where they've decided they no longer need the land that, or a certain date somewhat into the future, perhaps October 1, 2015, or something -- or 2014, be included in the legislation saying that the transfer will occur at that point because they are not ready to relinquish it at the moment. But if we don't identify a piece of land that will eventually be the site for this housing, then nothing can go forward in terms of getting started on trying to acquire the monies from the federal government to make this all start to come together.

So I hope that you can move forward with it. There was something else that was pointed out to me and that is that in the original language that I submitted to the committee requesting -- and I had a proposed bill requesting this to be done, it was always explained that the plan was to have the Town of Southbury lease this land to the senior housing organization, which is a

170

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

not-for-profit, that has been doing senior housing in the Town of Southbury.

One of the provisions was contained in the language in the bill before you says that it can't be leased by the Town of Southbury or else a reverter clause kicks in and the land would go back to the State. And I'm not quite sure exactly how we get around that but, obviously, the plan that they originally had wouldn't be able to work with that clause in there. I don't know if that language can be modified or if there's something that they can do or an arrangement between the town and the senior housing folks that will enable them to be able to use the land because they're the way that Southbury does senior housing, low-income senior housing, is through this not-for-profit organization.

And, again, thank you. And, hopefully, you will move forward with this legislation and this section contained therein. Any questions?

REP. JUTILA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Representative. Are you working on or do you have any suggested language to accomplish the somewhat unique situation that you have there?

REP. O'NEILL: Well, are you talking about the date and the timeline?

REP. JUTILA: Yes.

REP. O'NEILL: Well, what I described before, I mean, I can certainly reduce it to writing was push out the date at which the transfer would occur. In other words, the effective date for this section would be pushed out for a year or two or upon the Commissioner certifying that the land was available and no longer needed by

171

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

the Department of Developmental Services. I certainly can reduce that notion to writing and supply it to the committee. I think that's fairly straightforward.

REP. JUTILA: Okay. That sounds good. One way or the other, we'll try to help you get there. Thank you.

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Representative O'Neill, I have heard of your tremendous support of this facility and you're an advocate for the residents of that facility. Take me through, a little bit, not only does it house the elderly, but it has a history of being able to provide independent living resources for the developmentally disabled. Can you elaborate a little bit on the importance of that unheard history of it, but please share with me your advocacy in that area.

REP. O'NEILL: Well, what's been going on is, obviously, Southbury Training School started out as a pediatric facility 60 or 70 years ago. The population has been gradually aging. No new admissions have occurred. We haven't had a statute on the books for over 10 years and before that was a court case saying no new admissions since the mid 1980's. So the population has been aging. The population also has been going down. What we've tried to do is see the training school be as fully funded as possible by having all of the beds designated as ICFMR beds so that they get almost all of the money -- or much of the money to pay for those folks in those beds comes from the federal government. So the State is reaping a

significant amount of money from the federal government.

The State has tried to create not, essentially, a ward-type situation but something more akin to a small condominium-type situation in many of the buildings that have been converted into that fashion and even the Personnel Village, when it has been used in the past and is still being used I guess to a small extent. These individual houses were being treated as group homes for the residents of the Training School who were not yet able to be placed in the community for one reason or another.

So we've tried very hard to have Southbury Training School be part of the community in many ways. We have concerts. We have events that go on at the grounds of the Training School so that there's an opportunity for the residents to meet with people from the broader community, and an opportunity for the residents to come out of the training school to go to events in the town of Southbury, itself, to try and integrate as much as we can, the two groups. And I think that that's been significantly successful.

There's still are approximately 350 residents at the Training School. My guess is that that population is going to continue to decline since no new admissions are available and some people are leaving and, of course, there is a certain natural decline in population as people get older.

So what we have here is a facility that used to be in the range of 2,000 is now down to about, as I said, 350 in terms of the number of residents there. And we've really tried to keep the facility in compliance with all the

173

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

federal court orders. I think the State's done a very good job of upgrading Southbury Training School over the last 20 or 30 years and the quality of life there has improved enormously for the people that are living there compared to what was going on before.

I think that that's going to continue to occur but the campus is, in fact, consolidating. More and more buildings are, basically, being put aside because the population has shrunk so much over the last couple of decades. And so what this is about, this particular bill, is about recognizing that there are other needs that could be met with some of this land that's really not critical to the mission of the Department.

REP. HWANG: Through you, Mr. Chair, and isn't that a potential model that we can look at in regards to some of our state-owned facilities that have kind of gone through that bit of progression?

REP. O'NEILL: I think it is. I think, for example, the Southbury Training School Farm legislation, which is in the Environmental Committee right now, and I'm hoping will be reported out maybe today, maybe Wednesday, I assume will probably come to this committee, as it did a couple of years ago, and that it will be approved by this committee as it was a couple of years ago, will be a model for what to do with the agricultural lands attached to these large facilities that the State still owns.

We've got about five of them around the state, and if this'll provide a model for that. And I think also a planning model needs to be developed as to what to do with these buildings that they look very much like a college campus.

174

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

People walk up to it or drive up to it and say, Oh, this looks like a Norman Rockwell style New England college campus, but they need a lot of attention to be re-purposed going forward but that's a very long term kind of thing. We have time to work on developing that plan for the rest of the facility.

For right now, I think that it is modeled in terms of being able to enhance the quality of life for the residents that are there today.

REP. HWANG: And I appreciate that. Thank you. I think when we look at these budgetary challenges and we look at state institutions in comparison to privatization, I think Southbury is a great model to look at in the context of how it may differentiate from, like, a Riverview Hospital because what you've just described is it began as a pediatric facility and, in essence, you have residents that have grown. People past 60 years in residing there and the State is really transformed -- or Southbury -- has occurred is that fact that it's a community.

It's a place in which people have gotten to call home and family members with developmentally disabled children, have called it home and a sense of balance and independent living. Can you share me a little bit how that could be a little bit different from what a lot of people envision? State institutions and the structure that we currently know, like a Riverview.

REP. O'NEILL: Yes. I mean the situation in Southbury is in many ways very different from all other facilities that you might encounter, in part, because of the commitment that's been made to take care of people there for the long

175

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

term. And that it's the folks that are there have in many ways only known Southbury as their home since they were small children.

And what we've learned about the problems of the developmentally disabled, as they age, is enormously useful information that the staff in Southbury Training School has acquired. And I think that the benefit to the State of recognizing that we have this huge database, this bank of knowledge, that's in the heads of the employees, the staff, that work at the Training School is something that we should try and preserve as much as possible and communicate to other people because the problems of the developmentally disabled who age is something that we really haven't addressed.

Most nursing homes would be inappropriate venues and might even end up costing more than the folks at Southbury Training School are costing. We have to spend to take care of them there, and I think that what we're finding is that we're going to need more facilities and I'd love to see Southbury Training School recognized and re-purposed as a facility for the developmentally disabled elderly because that's what it's come to. It's sort of an accident. No one really planned it this way but having gotten to the point we are with it, it would be a good idea, I think, to take advantage of all of this knowledge that we gained in probably the most expensive way to learn things and that is by trial and error and through experience.

REP. HWANG: And I would agree with you, and I appreciate you sharing that kind of context. And I would caution the fact that it's something that the State needs to grapple with

176

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

as we move forward in this context, not only in regards to the current population of developmentally disabled that you just described, but also with the proliferation of autism diagnosis that we are experiencing. What are we to do as a state with that population as it ages and develops? And I think your description of Southbury and some of the information and data points that could be very useful is something that we, as a state, should really, really hone in on and utilize. And I want to thank you for your time on this. Thank you.

REP. O'NEILL: Thank you.

REP. JUTILA: Any other questions from members of the committee?

None, thank you, Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL: Thank you very much.

REP. JUTILA: Next speaker will be Steve Anderson followed by Michael Brandy and Lori Pelletier.

STEVE ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Representative Jutila, Representative Hwang and members of the GAE. My name is Steve Anderson. I am the secretary treasurer of CSEA-SCIU, Local 2001 and president of the P-4 Bargaining Unit, which is comprised of about 2500 scientists, engineers and information technology professionals employed by the State of Connecticut.

I work as an environmental analyst in the Connecticut Department of Agriculture. CSEA represents thousands of employees from across state service from bridge safety inspectors in DOT to IT professionals in all state agencies

HB6673

202

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

Looks like --

Is Laurie Albano here?

Yeah, okay, sorry.

LAURIE ALBANO: Good afternoon. Thank you.

My name is Laurie Albano. I'm the acting director of Parks and Recreation for the City of Stamford. And I'm here this afternoon to respectfully request that you convey Cubeta Stadium to the City of Stamford.

HB 6072

Cubeta is one of two major size baseball fields in the City of Stamford. And it's really essential to the City. It's woven into the fabric of Stamford. Many people don't associate it as a state field. They think it's a part of the City of Stamford and our beautiful Scalzi Park. Each year hundreds of young men and boys play baseball there. We host over 250 games annually, and we host many national, state, and local tournaments there.

We, currently, are on a lease with the State. That is set to expire this July. It's a 15-year lease and, as far as I can tell, it's been leased for, at least, 30 years. I've been with the city 16 years, and it had just come off a 15-year lease and now we're in another renewal period coming up this July.

As I said, Cubeta is a part of Stamford's Scalzi Park. There is one entrance, and it's right next door to the very -- large multipurpose park of Scalzi and Wright-Tech.

We love and maintain Cubeta like it's our own. The residents of Stamford do not -- as I said earlier, do not perceive Cubeta Stadium as a

city field. They think of it as a Stamford-based field.

The City of Stamford maintains the field operationally. We also maintain its capital infrastructure. We spent, approximately, \$30,000 a year on operational expenses, both in maintenance and supplies. We, currently, right now, have now have just spent \$36,000 redoing the electrical distribution center system for the field. We have \$500,000 that, so far, knock on wood, is still in our capital budget for complete lighting repairs at the stadium. And we love it and take care of it like it's our own and that it why we would like to see that it continues to be in our perpetual care and that the City of Stamford can own the field and make sure that it continues to be a part of the city.

We've also done many other enhancements over the years. As I said, we love it, we take care of it just like it's our own. We have redone the dugouts and drainage and infield and bleachers and press box, you know, just really love it and care for it like it's our own property. And we do understand that Wright Tech is reopening in September of 2014.

In the past, we have always had a very collaborative relationship with Wright Tech. The school's activities have always taken precedent and we understand that, that if field is conveyed to the City of Stamford, we would continuing to be a good neighbor to Wright Tech and make sure that the kids of that school still have the opportunity to use the park, use the field. Not only did Wright Tech use Cubeta but they often used Scalzi Park, as well, for a lot of their other activities. So we've always been good neighbors with Wright Tech, a very

204

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

collaborative relationship, and we don't see any reason why that would not continue.

So we're here today to respectfully request that you consider conveying Cubeta Stadium in Stamford, Connecticut, to the City of Stamford.

Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

Are there questions from members of the committee?

Yes, Representative Molgano.

REP. MOLGANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you --

Nice to see you, Laurie.

LAURIE ALBANO: You, too, Mike.

REP. MOLGANO: I know Cubeta Stadium a little bit longer but I remember when Bobby Valentine and Mo Vaughn played Twilight League Ball there so that's how far back we're going. This is before they went to the pros, by the way. So that's how long it's been here. I think -- it would be nice to hear how it actually is just an extension of Scalzi because I don't know if the committee really appreciates what Scalzi itself offers, all these different venues that are in that park as it is.

LAURIE ALBANO: Sure. As I said there's one entrance to get into Scalzi Park and Wright Tech and Cubeta Stadium. Scalzi Park is a well-loved urban, middle of the city, multipurpose park, both active and passive recreation, very well loved. It's just

205

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

undergone an almost \$6 million upgrade. It has a new walking trail. It has softball fields, a skate park, a ropes course for outdoor education, tennis courts, basketball courts, bocce courts, handball, a brand new playground, brand new small waterpark, pavilion where folks have picnics every weekend. It is loved and used by a cross-section of the entire City of Stamford. And Cubeta Stadium is within that park so, as Mike said, it is -- you know, people say that -- don't delineate the difference between the two. Cubeta Stadium goes into Scalzi Park, like Scalzi Park goes into Cubeta Stadium. There is really no differentiation in the Stamford residents' eyes.

And as Mike mentioned, Stamford has a very rich history in baseball because of guys, like Bobby valentine. But we've won many, many Babe Ruth national and state tournaments, American Legion baseball. Stamford has a deep and rich, glorious history and past in baseball. And it's a well-loved sport and still thriving in Stamford.

SENATOR MUSTO: So can I --

I'm sorry, Representative McConnell.

Okay.

So you're okay with the way the bill's written now or is there something you wanted to add. I'm not quite sure I understood.

LAURIE ALBANO: You know, I only had the letter in front of me. I have not seen the language and it's actually written into the bill.

SENATOR MUSTO: Well, it's going to convey to the City of Stamford 6.6 acres identified as portion of the 18.6-acre parcel that contains Cubeta Stadium, and said parcel is identified on the map and then it goes to the map. So I'm not quite sure if that's the total land that you're asking for or if the park was more?

LAURIE ALBANO: No, I believe it is. I do have a map with me, that is the stadium proper.

SENATOR MUSTO: Okay. So the 6.6 acres that comprises the stadium -- or I should say that includes the stadium that's what you're looking for?

LAURIE ALBANO: That's the request. Yes, sir.

SENATOR MUSTO: Okay. So that's what the bill seems to say. I would encourage you to read the section 7 of the bill just to make sure that we're not missing something. And other than that, I appreciate you coming up and giving us your testimony.

Yes, Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Hi, Laurie.

Thank you for coming up to testify today. So, honestly, I'm one of those members of Stamford that did not know that Cubeta's park belonged to the state. And I want to commend the City of Stamford for the work the facelift that they've given it and also the facelift that they've given Scalzi Park. I just want to let my members know -- my colleagues know that everything you're saying is true. You're looking at someone that walks in park at least five days a week. Cubeta Park -- I mean, the stadium, it's highly utilized. You can hear

207

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

the excitement with the individuals playing baseball.

I want to thank you for the facelift that you've given the park itself. And with the work that that's being worked on and completed on Wright Tech, and I think the park is going to have a whole different atmosphere.

Do you know the history behind how we -- how the state got that piece of land? Because I was told that it was a member of Stamford that had given the land to the State to be used for education purposes, like Wright Tech. And I don't know if the recreational piece is a part of that because it looks like it's about 18.6 acres and Cubeta is right is right next door to Wright Tech. And so do you know the history of that, at all?

LAURIE ALBANO: You know, no. I'm a little bit fuzzy on it. But what you just said does jog my memory a little bit. I do believe there was a connection with a Stamford resident.

Mike, I'm not sure if you know either?

But, no, I don't. I can't say for sure, can't say for sure.

REP. MILLER: Through you, Mr. Chairman. So you said that the City has -- you have invested how much so far in the park since you've leased it?

LAURIE ALBANO: We've invested, within the Cubeta Stadium itself?

REP. MILLER: Yes.

LAURIE ALBANO: Well, we spent -- let's see, we spend about 30,000 of just operational

208

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

expenditures a year out of our operational budget to man hours and supplies. But we recently just spent \$36,000 to upgrade the electrical system. We have \$500,000 in our upcoming capital budget for all the lighting fixtures to be replaced.

And Kevin, what would you -- do you have anything else on that, Kevin?

I have Kevin Murray here with me, my parks manager.

KEVIN MURRAY: Yes. Just to echo what Laurie was saying we have a capital budget to change out the light structures at Cubeta Stadium.

SENATOR MUSTO: Would you mind identifying yourself for the record, please.

KEVIN MURRAY: I'm sorry. Kevin Murray, AFB parks director.

We have identified \$550,000 to upgrade the lights at Cubeta Stadium, also earmarked \$36,000 to reduce the safety hazard at the distribution center that has not been changed out since, I want to say, 1975. We also got volunteer help, along with city employees, to paint the grandstand, which the City has supplied all the paint.

REP. MILLER: Through you, Mr. Chairman. So I can assume since the City of Stamford is going to make a half a million dollar investment and your lease is expiring in July?

LAURIE ALBANO: This July.

209

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

REP. MILLER: So I can assume that -- you assume that there will be a continuation of at least the lease?

LAURIE ALBANO: At least. We would have some very disappointed residents if we don't.

REP. MILLER: Do you know how much -- through you, Mr. Chairman. Do you know how much you spend a year on the lease? You pay the State per year?

LAURIE ALBANO: There's a -- I think it's one of those dollar -- 15 years for a dollar.

REP. MILLER: Thank you and, Laurie, again, thank you for coming up.

Mr. Murray, thank you for coming up, as well.

LAURIE ALBANO: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

SENATOR MUSTO: Excuse me.

Other questions?

Well, if there are none, you can sit down somewhere else. Okay. Thank you very much.

Did Lori Pelletier come back?

No. Okay, so we'll go -- from ROVAC, Mr. Cody, was it?

Good evening.

Close enough, five o'clock somewhere.

GEORGE CODY: My name is George Cody. I am the registrar of voters in New Canaan. And actually, I'm not here on behalf of ROVAC

JB4

245

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

the -- I hope I'm not precluding you from ever applying for a job with the ACLU -- and I probably shouldn't -- but I didn't know if you had any response?

AARON GOLDZIMER: I can get back to you with more specific details. My partner from Yale was addressing the constitutional questions more directly, but we believe that -- he was making two arguments: a constitutional argument and a policy argument.

My response would have been then please offer language that could have resolved his concerns, but he didn't do that and so that's, I think, what my response would be.

REP. LESSER: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Other questions?

No, thank you very much.

AARON GOLDZIMER: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Tom D'Amore?

Helena Jedlinsky?

And the next few people up will be Abdul Shahid, Kristie Barber and Joel Abramson.

HELENA JEDLINSKY: Good evening. Thank you for being here to listen. I'm here in support of Bill 6672, section 8 that does not mean that I'm going crazy.

My name is Helena Jedlinsky. I'm secretary of the Pomperaug Senior Housing and Southbury Elderly Housing Board of Directors. In the rest of my remarks, I will shorten it to Grace

Meadows, which is the name of the housing complex.

Grace Meadows is the housing complex for low to moderate income housing in Southbury, Connecticut. It's the only one. I have lived in Southbury for 37 years and in Connecticut for 52 years so I'm not new to how Connecticut works.

I am here to speak in favor of section 8 of Bill 6672. Housing for low to moderate income seniors in Connecticut is in very high demand. Southbury has, at present, 88 units at Grace Meadows. These are designed and built between 1985 and 2004. The complex is for all ages, all persons aged 62 and older who meet the financial guidelines. A portion of our complex is also available for handicapped or disabled of any age also meeting the financial guidelines.

The entire facility is designed for independent living within a nonmedical support environment. Since its inception, the waiting list for moving into the complex has been between 100 and 300 applications. At present, the waitlist is 145. Grace Meadows -- one-half of Grace Meadows is financed by the USDA Rural Development, and the other half is financed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The entire complex is managed by the Elderly Housing Management with an on-site administrator and staff to provide administrative and maintenance to the complex and the residents.

The property is owned by the Town of Southbury, which leases it to Grace Meadows. The board of directors -- we are unpaid -- of the complex is

247

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

comprised of local individuals of various backgrounds, ages, and interests.

The Town of Southbury supports and endorses the concept and presence of Grace Meadows and its expansion. The Grace Meadows board of directors, assisted by the Town of Southbury, has completed a thorough search of appropriate property for expansion. The parcel of land represented in section 8 of Bill 6672 on the Southbury Training School campus has been identified as fitting the need ideally. It has the much-needed reasonable access to town water, sewer and natural gas. The property of 45 acres is in one corner of the Southbury Training School property and would allow for appropriate access to seniors via Route 172.

The property will soon be vacated from the use by Southbury Training School. With the State of Connecticut's commitment of this land for low to moderate income housing, the Grace Meadows board of directors would initiate the process of acquiring federal housing dollars to build approximately 90 apartments for appropriate seniors and disabled persons. The transfer of this parcel of land from the State of Connecticut to the Town of Southbury for the express purpose of building senior housing units would benefit all seniors in the State of Connecticut. Thank you for your attention and interest.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

Are there questions from members of the committee.

No, thank you very much.

HELENA JEDLINSKY: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Oh, I'm sorry.

REP. HWANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to be really quick.

I want to thank you for staying so long, and I appreciate you coming through. Now are you working with Representative O'Neil in this effort, as well?

HELENA JEDLINSKY: Two years now. Yes, we are. He has been very supportive.

REP. HWANG: Tremendous. Thank you, thank you very much for participating in the democratic process.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

Mr. Ansari?

Sorry. This Craig Holman is not here. Correct? Okay.

Thank you.

ADBUL SHAHID ANSARI: Good evening. My name is Abdul Shahid Muhammad Ansari, and I'm the president of the Greater Hartford Branch of NAACP. I testified before you today in representation of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People in opposition of SB 1146. I read the following statement authored by both our national and statewide presidents supporting the NAACP's position against this bill.

SENATOR MUSTO: Next is Kristie Barber. It's Barber?

Joel Abramson. After Mr. Abramson is Marshall Dubaldo, and I am having a lot of trouble with Herbert-someone. Well, hopefully, we'll see if those people are here.

Yes, proceed, sir. Thank you.

FRED MCGEE: Chairman Musto, I am not Joel Abramson. I am Fred McGee, president of Grace Meadows. As Helena has said, just use Grace Meadows for both the entities. Joel had to leave at five o'clock and so I am taking this opportunity to just present what he has written. And instead of reading it through, with your permission, I would just like to make one statement to emphasize one thing.

HB6672

I've been on the board since we formed it back in 1980, and we were able to construct the first of four sections of the facility in 1985. Point being that it takes a while from getting the land to going through the federal procedures, contracts, everything else, to get a facility going. So we've got at least five years out if we have the land today to do the expansion. So time is of the essence.

One of the important part of this particular parcel is it has water, it has sewage and it has gas. When we did our first unit, we had none of those; and as a result, the costs were prohibitive to put in septic, get water and then put a septic system over what is one of the most important aquifers in Connecticut and that is tricky. So this piece of property just eliminates all of those difficulties and makes it much easier to do the project.

252

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

Also, the federal government in making the funds available does not pay for any off-site developments. "Off-site" meaning sewage, pipe, off-site, off the property that we own, water pipes to get there and so this property already has it right on the site. We don't have to do much in the way of off-site costs. So I would very much appreciate your very affirmative action on Bill 6672, section 8, and thank you for your consideration.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

Are there any questions from members of the committee?

No, you're free to go.

Marshall Dubaldo. Mr. Dubaldo?

It looks like Herbert or Robert -- no?

Well, Masgerine Mines?

A VOICE: Margaret Miner.

SENATOR MUSTO: Margaret -- Margaret Miner?

A VOICE: The Great Margaret Miner.

SENATOR MUSTO: The Great -- you got to work on your handwriting before you come back to the committee, Ms. Miner. Welcome.

MARGARET MINER: The nuns would second that motion. I'm here to testify on 6672. I represent Rivers Alliance of Connecticut. We work to serve to protect rivers and other state waters.

A couple of items really stand out in 6672. One is the Middletown Hospital. We strongly support conserving those reservoirs on the wooded lands around them, very important tract of land in Middletown. I raised the question as to whether the State will accept a conservation easement on state-owned land. That's been something we've been talking about back and forth. The State has been reluctant in many cases so I'm hoping that a conservation solution would be found, perhaps, another entity might hold the easement. There are various other approaches.

I congratulate the committee. The act is a lot easier to follow, although there wasn't much time. There was a land conservation conference this weekend so people were able to look through it. Some of the recommendations I put in there just came up as groups were looking through it. A map would be helpful, some more notice, more detail on the purpose and, in particular, more detail, perhaps, on the applicant or the application. Who's asking for this? Why? When I sit here, I often get those answers but it's hard to do -- to figure out the some of the conveyances ahead of time.

And I mentioned a couple where, including Representative O'Neill for Grace Meadows, which I hadn't understood and couldn't catch up to him until this morning.

Finally, we have been working on the section 10 issue since at least 2009 so I thank you. I thank you for moving in that direction. If there is any desire, at any time, to revisit it and partly recently the Land Conservation Review Board has been revived -- it hadn't met for a while -- a group that's a statute-based review board for conservation plans and

programs. We're working with the DEEP on their open-space plans, trying to help implement Public Act 05-152, which was open-space bill last year. So I'm hoping that will be coming up with policies that are good for conservation lands, good for the State, and would provide a more rational and predictable way to go forward when these kinds of exchanges are being considered. So that's my testimony and thank you very much.

I just want to emphasize, again, how important that Middletown land is to the people in that community.

SENATOR MUSTO: Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Margaret, for saying how important that section is. I had something to do with the authoring of it, and I appreciate your support.

I did want to just respond quickly to something you said, questioning whether or not we can do it. My understanding from speaking with Commissioner Esty is that was something that we have done before but if there are alternate solutions in order to protect that land, I'd certainly be interested in hearing from it. But I certainly appreciate your strong support in the Rivers Alliance, as well.

MARGARET MINER: Thank you. I just wanted to raise a red flag that if you hit a barrier going that direction. I, frankly, hope you don't -- that we would love to work on some other solution with you and all of the people in your community.

255

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

SENATOR MUSTO: Don't go anywhere.

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER: Margaret, I wasn't sure that you realized there were two Southbury bills.

MARGARET MINER: I figured -- I realized that there were two, but I didn't understand why. I couldn't reach Representative O'Neill over the weekend, but I did see him here and he explained to me and I heard the testimony but I --

SENATOR MEYER: Because the Southbury bill that's before this committee is in the conveyance and relates to public housing; and the one before the Environment Committee relates to one that your supporting and that's a conservation matter.

MARGARET MINER: Right. We support that strongly. And on the matter of Grace Meadows, we haven't studied it so we're neutral but Art O'Neill is my representative so --

SENATOR MEYER: And he's a good one. The conservation easement Southbury bill is going to be voted on by the Environment Committee on Wednesday just so you know.

MARGARET MINER: Okay. I'll be applauding -- or whatever.

SENATOR MEYER: Thanks.

MARGARET MINER: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Other questions?

Thank you.

MARGARET MINER: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Ken Green is up next and after Mr. Green, Melissa Schlag, Ryan Anderson and Steve Rocco and that is all we have on our list so if anyone else would like to sign up, now is your chance.

Welcome.

KEN GREEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I come here to discuss four bills. Two, I think, are very similar. And I have similar comments I want to talk about those two and then two others which are different.

The first two is Raised Bill 1148, AN ACT REDEFINING OF THE TERM MEETING FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, and I want to talk about that in association with Committee Bill Number 727, AN ACT CONCERNING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST UNDER THE CODE OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND STATE EMPLOYEES.

On the Bill Number 1148, I am here in opposition to the new language that is being proposed. I am not sure of what the purpose is of the new language, but I would get concerned anytime certain kinds of meetings are removed from the Freedom of Information Act.

It appears to me that negotiations between different political parties to come up with some kind of agreement on something is the purpose of exempting those meetings from the Freedom of Information Act. However, with reading about some of the recent activities for some of the quasi-public agencies and some of the other things that have been happening in

262

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: Pardon me?

KEN GREEN: I was born and raised in Hartford so if I'm in Hartford, I'm always home.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: You raised a very interesting point about early voting and when is the ballot counted? Is it counted on Election Day or is it counted on the day it was actually executed.

SB4

In the case of someone who is deceased on election day, what do we do? I think you raised an interesting point because, with an absentee ballot, it is numbered and we know whose ballot is who up until that time it can be pulled out, I believe. That's not the case with a regular Election Day form of balloting so did you have any further ideas of how that might be corrected?

KEN GREEN: No, I don't.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: Thank you, but thank you for raising that point.

SENATOR MUSTO: Other questions from members of the committee?

No, thank you very much.

KEN GREEN: Thank you.

SENATOR MUSTO: Melissa Schlag.

MELISSA SCHLAG: Thank you for being so patient. You guys must be tired. I just added a bill now because of the gentleman before me that I wanted to testify for, and I will be very quick.

SB1148
HB6672
SB1146

263

March 25, 2013

lk

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

I'm against Bill 1148, the FOI bill, because as you said, Senator Meyer -- and I don't know if I stated my name, Melissa Schlag -- but I think that that would also eliminate any FOI-able notes from board of selectman meetings in towns throughout the state, a meeting between a first selectman -- Republican first selectman and any second Democratic selectman now would not be FOI'able and that, to me, would be a public meeting.

The other two bills, the first one I'm going to testify as the executive director of Citizens Protection of Public Lands, and that is Bill 6672, the conveyance bill.

As to the conveyance bill, I would like to applaud your efforts to finally put closure on Special Act 11-16, section 8, the infamous Haddam Land Swap that swept Connecticut and the Legislature into national news last year. The repeal of this act restores lost space in the system of conserving our public lands and will help prevent the transfer of conservation lands to private developers in the future.

As you know, the developers pulled out of the deal after the independent appraisals came out significantly different with the State conservation land overlooking the river worth \$1.3 million more than the land to be conveyed to the State by the developer. We need to close this store forever because, as it is written now, it is still wide open with the opportunity for any developer to take this public land.

Section 10 of HB 6672 will finally put this bad policy and negativity behind us.

272

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

SENATOR MUSTO: And last on the list is Steve Rocco. After Mr. Rocco, is there anyone who plans on testifying who has not signed up?

Mr. Rocco, thank you.

STEVE ROCCO: I was going to say "good afternoon" but now I'll say good evening.

Good evening to the members of the committee and the chairs. My name is Steve Rocco, and I'm an architect and a planner. I'm one of the partners of The Riverhouse Banquet and Conference Center in Haddam. We also run the Society Room here in Hartford and the Bell Terrace at the Avon Old Farms Inn in Avon.

I'm here to ask you to please delete Section 10 of Bill 6672, known as the Conveyance Bill. Section 10 of this year's conveyance bill asks to repeal Section 8 of the Special Act 11-16 to the 2011 Conveyance Bill which authorized the property exchange between The Riverhouse and the State of Connecticut, also known as the Haddam Land Swap. I am the person who has most been involved with this proposal from the start and after eight years of work, thousands of hours of time spent, many of thousands of dollars spent in close examination and approval by the legislature, I do not want to see this just sort of arbitrarily or quickly repealed with one line in a bill.

Section 10 doesn't mention what it's repealing nor who submitted it, nor is there anything in the committee clerk's file as to why it should be repealed. It should not. This is unfinished business. This bill and this matter has been thoroughly vetted and debated through three legislative sessions, including by this committee and some of the members who are here

273

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

tonight, and it was duly approved in overwhelming numbers. Because of all the attention, the Governor drove to Haddam to inspect the two properties personally before signing the bill and he declared that the deal seemed fair to him. That's a quote. And the fact is this whole concept of this land exchange for the property which surrounds The Riverhouse was first proposed to us, to me, by deputy commissioner of the DEEP, David Leff, in 2005, as a way for the state to improve the quality of its holdings. It was then reiterated, brought up again, in 2007, by Commissioner Gina McCarthy to me, personally.

DEEP was trying to divest themselves apart of the property they bought in the (inaudible) section of Haddam. The part on the river they meant to keep. The part that was inland, which was the former sand pit, they were trying to see if they could improve their holdings. This began a six year odyssey which culminated in the approval in 2011 and all of the effort should be suddenly just made to disappear by a line in the bill two years later.

I won't take you through all of the details of the proposal unless you want me to and you have questions about it and all of the history. I don't think you want to retry the whole case but the land swap was the subject of much discussion, as you know, and a great deal of misleading factually incorrect publicity. It was said that it was riverfront land; it wasn't. It was said that it was virgin land; it wasn't. It was an old sand pit. It was surrounded by other industrial and commercial properties so there are a lot of good people who felt very passionately that this was a bad idea but they had bad information.

274

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

There were lengthy public hearings during which much testimony was offered. There were in-depth reviews of maps and photos for the properties in both the House and the Senate. And in the end the measure was supported overwhelmingly across party lines. It was approved because the main portion of the state property is a former sand pit, which is surrounding The Riverhouse, and it's overrun with invasive plants surrounded by commercial/industrial properties, isolated and far removed from any other open space or open space corridors.

The 87-acre parcel that we purchased to swap with the State, which we purchased after the negotiations began and which was approved before we purchased it by Commissioner McCarthy. It is pristine forest land. It would add to and strategically connect Cockaponset State Forest with Route 81 in Higganum. The DEEP liked it in --

SENATOR MUSTO: Could you just wrap up your comments, please.

STEVE ROCCO: Sorry.

SENATOR MUSTO: Could you just wrap up your comments please.

STEVE ROCCO: Okay.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

STEVE ROCCO: DEEP liked it, particularly, because it gave access to the north end of Cockaponset, which was at that point landlocked that way for fire or rescue measures. Skipping ahead --

275

March 25, 2013

lk GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

The reason we're still talking about is after the bill was signed by the Governor, appraisals were done and about a year ago, right now, the values of the appraisals were made public -- well, were made known to us by the DEEP. And whereas the appraisals that were done in 2009, under Commissioner McCarthy, had the property almost the same value, in fact, ours was \$200,000 higher. In 2011, our property value had suddenly been cut in half; and the property value of the state value suddenly went up by 60 percent, \$600,000, during the worst real estate market since the Depression.

There was a lot of problems with the appraisals, in our opinion. We had them reviewed by a third-party appraiser.

SENATOR MUSTO: Sir, if you could just finish up your comments, please. I'd appreciate it.

STEVE ROCCO: Okay. Point is, the partners of The Riverhouse have not come to a conclusion about whether or not to go back to DEEP and pursue this, whether to challenge the appraisals legally, or whatever other methods are available to us. We would like to have the ability to come to a conclusion ourselves after everything that we all went through to get to this point. So we just, respectfully, ask that that section be deleted from the bill and the legislation be allowed to stand.

SENATOR MUSTO: Thank you.

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER: Mr. Rocco -- and I address my colleagues on the committee, as well. In my eight years in the state Legislature, I have never seen a transaction stunk as much as that

one. Let me tell you why just quickly because people can differ on this:

Senator Daily introduced this bill for some years and couldn't get it past Governor Rell -- said she'd veto it. Commissioners of DEEP urged her not to do it and came to us and said -- and I speak as chairman of the Environmental Committee -- came to us and said we don't like it. And then DEEP, to make sure it didn't happen, promulgated standards for the conveyance of any of its land and those were strict standards. And those standards, despite great protest, were absolutely ignored by the Connecticut General Assembly and the Governor. And then the deed that was involved here had a specific -- it wasn't binding -- but it was a specific reference to the fact that this land would be held open and free forever, in perpetuity. And then they were so far apart, as another witness said earlier today, there were \$1.3 million apart in the values of the exchange.

This is something that the Environment Committee got dozens of letters from people saying never, ever again, will I donate land to the State of Connecticut because what happened with that transaction and that vote was dishonorable to the State of Connecticut. And I think that the bill that's going to repeal that is consistent with the fact that we do repeal conveyances that don't take place and is also consistent with the fact that this is a transaction that we should have never ever acknowledge again.

STEVE ROCCO: Senator Meyer, I respectfully completely disagree with you. You realize that this land was not donated? The State paid \$6 million for that land, again, with no public

hearings, no public knowledge. Nobody in the Town of Haddam even knew it was being purchased, and it had been identified by the Town as the most valuable commercial development property in the town.

When this started, I will say, also, that Senator Daily had nothing to do with it. This started in conversations with Riverhouse partners and DEEP. We were talking to DEEP because DEEP owned that property and we had gone to ask if we could get permission to cut down some of the weed trees, the invasive trees, that were growing up on the bank behind The Riverhouse.

At that point, Commissioner Leff said to us, Instead of you coming back here every five years to try to get permission to cut the trees again, we should see if we can trade you the property. We can't sell it to you because of the funding that it came from, but we can trade for better open space as long as it benefits the citizens of the State of Connecticut. And that's how this started.

So there's been a lot of conjecture. There have been a lot of rumors and narratives spun about this, but that's how it started.

I'm happy to answer any questions about anything from the whole history of it.

SENATOR MUSTO: Are there any questions about anything from any other members of the committee?

No, okay. Well, thank you very much.

STEVE ROCCO: Thank you for your time. Good night.



State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

Spoken
3/25/13

Line Number 15

Page Number 18

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR J. O'NEILL
SIXTY-NINTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

HOME (203) 264-3112
TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
FAX (860) 240-0207
Arthur.ONeill@housegop.ct.gov

DEPUTY REPUBLICAN LEADER- AT- LARGE

CHAIRMAN
LAW REVISION COMMISSION

MEMBER
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*Testimony by Representative Arthur J. O'Neill
Before the Government, Administration and Elections Committee
On House Bill 6672
March 25, 2013*

Good morning Chairman Musto and Jutila, Ranking Members McLachlan and Hwang, and members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee. I want to thank you for including section 8 of House Bill 6672. This section includes the substance of a proposed bill that I proposed which would transfer land from the state of Connecticut to become Southbury.

The purpose of this transfer is to allow the town to provide this land to Southbury senior housing authorities for the purpose of developing new subsidized low income senior housing. The Townsouth break has a long commitment to providing such low income housing to seniors. The existing housing in Southbury has a long waiting list. As you may know Southbury has a larger concentration of citizens over the age of 65 years than any town in Connecticut. Most senior citizen low income housing is a more pressing need than in most towns.

With the decline in the economy, especially the decline in interest rates from which many seniors derive a large part of their income, the need for low income senior housing has become even more acute than in the past.

In order for the housing authorities to begin the process of applying for federal grants and or loans, it is necessary for them to identify a location at which they believe that the housing can be built. That process will probably take a year or two to come to fruition. However it cannot start unless a piece of land is identified as the location.

Therefore it is important that the state begin the process of recognizing the need for the senior housing. It is my understanding that the Department of Developmental Services is in the process of closing down what is known as Personnel Village (PV). While it has not closed down PV completely at the present time, it is planned to close down in the near future. Thus identifying this piece of land as a future location for senior housing should not interfere with the department's current operations or its longer-term planning.

I look forward to working with the Department Developmental Services in creating a solution to the needs of both the Department and the Town of Southbury.

Again thank you for including section 8 in the bill and I look forward to working with the committee to see this section reported out along with the rest of the bill.

Thank You

Rep. O'Neill

March 25, 2013

Frederick Mc Lee
spoke for Joel Abramson
In Support of Bill # 6672, Section 8

My name is Joel Abramson and I am Vice president of Southbury Elderly Housing, Inc. and Pomperaug Senior Housing, Inc.

Together, these entities own the Southbury, CT complex known as Grace Meadows, located at the corner of North Poverty Road and Route 67.

Grace Meadows is a not for profit entity, the mission of which is to provide affordable housing for the elderly. For our purposes elderly is defined as age 62 or over. We also accept younger handicapped adults. Southbury Elderly Housing owns 48 units and receives funding from USDA Rural Development. Pomperaug Senior Housing owns 40 units and receives funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The land we are on is owned by the Town of Southbury and is leased to us at extremely favorable terms. Throughout our existence the town has been unfailingly supportive of our mission.

Grace Meadows started operations in 1985. We have no room for expansion. Our waiting list is continually updated and culled. The wait time is numerous years long, meaning that for many applicants over 62 it is virtually hopeless, and in truth, heart-rending. Our need to expand is critical.

The parcel of land mentioned in Bill # 6672 is part of the Southbury Training School property, which parcel we understand will one day become available. It is about 45 acres in size, of which 23 are unimproved. Located on the east side of State Route 172, it has access to water, gas and electricity. Our understanding is that the Training School is closing the area to further housing of its staff. It would be ideal for our purposes.

Our hope is that the property can be deeded over to the Town, which would then make it available to Grace Meadows for our desperately needed expansion. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Joel Abramson

Spoken
3/25/13

Spoken
3/25/13

Government Administration and Elections Committee

State Of Connecticut

Line Number 2 Re: Bill # 6672, Section 8Page Number 25

My name is Helena Jedlinsky, I'm secretary of the Board of Directors of Grace Meadows the senior low to moderate income housing in Southbury, CT. I have lived in Southbury for 37 years & in CT for 52 years.

I am here to speak in favor of Section 8 of Bill # 6672.

Housing for the low to moderate income seniors in Connecticut is in high demand. Southbury has at present eighty-eight units at Grace Meadows designed and built between 1985 & 2004. The complex is for all persons aged 62 years or older who meet the financial guidelines, a portion also accept handicapped or disabled of any age. The entire facility is designed for independent living within a non-medical supported environment. Since its inception the waiting list for moving into the complex has been between 100 & 300 applications. At present the wait list is 145.

GM I & II financed by USDA Rural Development and GM III & IV is financed by US Department of Housing and Urban Development. The entire complex is managed by Elderly Housing Management with an on-site Administrator and staff to provide administrative and maintenance services to the complex and its residents. The property is owned by the Town of Southbury which leases it to Grace Meadows.

The Board of Directors (unpaid) of the complex is comprised of local individuals of various backgrounds, ages and interests. The Town of Southbury supports and endorses the concept and presence of Grace Meadows and its expansion.

The GM Board of Directors assisted by the Town of Southbury has completed a thorough search for appropriate property for expansion. The parcel of land represented in Section 8 of Bill # 6672 on the Southbury Training School (STS) campus has been identified as fitting the need ideally. It has the much needed reasonable access to town water, sewer and natural gas. The property of 45 acres is in one corner of the STS property and would allow for appropriate access to seniors via route 172. The property will soon be vacated from use by STS. With the State of Connecticut's commitment of this land for low & moderate income senior housing, Grace Meadows Board of Directors would initiate the process of acquiring federal housing dollars to build approximately 90 apartments for appropriate seniors & disabled persons.

The transfer of this parcel of land from the State of Connecticut to the Town of Southbury for the express purpose of building senior housing units would benefit all seniors in the State of Connecticut.

Thank you for your attention & interest,

Respectfully,

Helena M. Jedlinsky
03-24-13

Line Number 5Page Number 21

3 977 4150

3 977 5845

E-MAIL: MPAVIA@CI.STAMFORD.CT.US

MICHAEL A. PAVI
MAYOR
CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT



Spoken
3/25/13

Good morning Senator Musto, Representative Jutila and distinguished members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee. My name is Laurie Albano. I am the Acting Director of Parks and recreation and I am here today representing the City of Stamford and Mayor Pavia in seeking your support for Section 7 of HB 6672 An Act Concerning the Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land. Section 7 would convey Cubeta Stadium from the State of Connecticut to the City of Stamford.

As one of two major league sized fields in our parks system, Cubeta Stadium is essential to baseball in Stamford. Cubeta is woven into the fabric of Stamford's very active baseball community and a part of its glorious past. Each year hundreds of young boys and men look forward to playing there. Cubeta hosts over 250 games per summer season and is home to Babe Ruth, American Legion, 19 and Over and 30 and Over baseball leagues. In addition it hosts various State and National Tournaments and it is not an exaggeration to say that without Cubeta, there would not be baseball as we know it in Stamford. The current lease with the State of CT/Department of Education expires on July 21, 2013, however, to the best of our knowledge it has been leased for well over 30 years. We respectfully urge your support for the conveyance of Cubeta Stadium to the City of Stamford.

Cubeta is also a close neighbor to Stamford's recently upgraded Scalzi Park sharing the same entrance, and to the public eye, very little delineation is seen differentiating the park from the stadium emphasizing Cubeta even more as part of the Stamford community. Stamford citizens do not make a distinction between Cubeta and Scalzi, they are one in the same. In addition we make investments in Cubeta as if it were our own based not only on our current lease, but also out of our pride in the Stadium. Our parks maintenance staff devotes significant time and resources (over 800 labor hours per year) at an approximate cost of \$30,000 annually doing day to day operational maintenance. In addition we make repairs both small and large scale. Recently we have just ordered a new \$36K electrical distribution system and panels and over \$500K is earmarked for fiscal year 13/14 capital repairs/replacement of the entire sports lighting fixtures. We recently along with local volunteers scrubbed and painted the entire bleachers. Other repairs and enhancements include custom windscreens, infield grading, dug out renovation/drainage, padded safety railings and turf management protocols. Given the above and the millions of dollars recently spent renovating Scalzi Park, Cubeta completes the range of recreation opportunities of this beloved urban passive and active recreation center.

Should Cubeta be conveyed to the City of Stamford, it is understood that after J.M. Wright Technical High School re-opens, we will as always provide the stadium to the school for its inter-scholastic baseball program and special events such as graduation ceremonies. As in the past we will continue to be a good neighbor and collaborator with Wright Tech.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this request and it is our great hope that Cubeta Stadium will forever be a part of the City of Stamford via its ownership of it and its perpetual care and pride in it.

Laurie Albano

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Laurie Albano". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dir. Parks and Recreation

*Written
3-25-13*

State of Connecticut

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL**

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL L. MOLGANO
ONE HUNDRED FORTY-FOURTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

HOME (203) 461-8551
CAPITOL (860) 240-8700
TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
Michael.Molgano@housegop.ct.gov

MEMBER
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Testimony

In Support of Proposed Bill 6672 An Act Concerning the Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land

Government Administration and Elections Committee

March 25, 2013

Honorable Co-Chairs Senator Musto and Representative Jutila, Honorable Vice-Chairs Senator Meyer and Representative Lesser, Ranking Members Senator McLachlan and Representative Hwang, and my fellow distinguished members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee:

I am writing in strong support of HB 6672, An Act Concerning the Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land.

Section seven of HB 6672 conveys Cubeta Stadium from the State of Connecticut to the City of Stamford. Cubeta Stadium is an institution in Stamford and has long been home to several baseball leagues, including Babe Ruth, American Legion, 19 and Over, and 30 and Over baseball leagues. Cubeta also hosts State and National Tournaments. Stamford owes much of her rich history in sports to the memorable games played at Cubeta. Before beginning their professional careers, Stamford native Bobby Valentine and Norwalk native Mo Vaughn played in Cubeta as

members of the Stamford Twilight League. There were even thoughts of Cubeta Stadium being home to a minor league team.

Cubeta Stadium is located within Stamford's Scalzi Park. Scalzi provides the residents of Stamford with softball fields, Little League fields, a skate park, tennis courts, handball courts, and bocce courts. There is even open space for outdoor concerts. The regular scheduled upkeep and maintenance of all these venues, including Cubeta Stadium, has been and continues to be normal operating procedure by the City of Stamford. Conveying Cubeta to the City is simply providing proper ownership to the longstanding responsible and accountable party.

Stamford is excited that J. M. Wright Technical High School is on schedule to reopen in the fall of 2014. The City fully understands and is committed to ensuring Cubeta Stadium is available to J. M. Wright's inter-scholastic baseball program and to any and all of J. M. Wright's special events, including graduation commencement exercises. The time-honored strong relationship that has existed between the City of Stamford and J. M. Wright Technical High School will remain.

Thank you for allowing me to submit testimony on HB 6672, and I ask you please give this important land conveyance bill your full support.

Sincerely,



Michael L. Molgano
State Representative, 144th District
Stamford

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Jack Fiora <r.fiora@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 9:37 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Written
3/25/13

Cynthia,

P

Please vote in favor for Bill HR 6672, so this type of back door deal
does not happen again

Thank You,

Jack Fiora
169 Ballahack Rd #2
East Haddam, Ct. 06423
jack @ppo2.com

Dunne, Cynthia

From: jchemingson@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 9:46 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Written
3/25/13

Dear Ms Dunne,

I am writing in support of HB6672, Proposed 2013 Conveyance Bill to Permanently Repeal Haddam Land Swap (HB6672).

As a long-time member of my town's land trust and The Nature Conservancy, I urge the legislature to uphold the preservation of this piece of land in perpetuity.

Sincerely,

Joyce Hemingson, Ph D
P.O Box 207
Colebrook, CT 06021

Dunne, Cynthia

From: kennethmrobbins@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 9:17 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672 Sect 10

Written
3/25/13

I wish to go on record as STRONGLY supporting the repeal of the Haddam land swap legislation. The swap is unequal, unfair to Connecticut citizens, and violates the intent and, frankly, the need, as expressed in the original owner's bequeath of this land. The beautiful and invaluable river front land must remain as a public trust for all Connecticut citizens to enjoy now and in the future.

Ken
860-930-9332

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Richard Lammlin <rflam45@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:43 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

*Section 0!
Dunne's
w/ HB
swap*

Please permanently kill this swap. The riverfront land should stay as it is. I hope this will never come up again.

Rich Lammlin
FVGEC
860 578 5837
Sent from my RFLphone

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Jelle de Boer <jdeboer@wesleyan.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 11:58 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB 6672. Section 10

Hereby my strong support for a repeal of the Haddam Land Swap, HB 6672-Section10.
The evidence that any swap is a bad idea, continuous to be be overwhelming!!

Dr.Jelle Zeilinga de Boer
Prof. of Earth Science, emer.
Wesleyan University

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Myraaronow <myraaronow@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:19 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672 Section 10

Written
3/25/13

Dear Ms. Dunne,

As a Connecticut resident, I would like to register my opinion that HB 6672 Section 10 should be voted on in the affirmative. The Haddam Land Swap was shameful and should be permanently put behind us.

Sincerely, Myra Aronow, 1 Haddam Dock

Road, Haddam, CT

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Nancy Borge <nborge@snet.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:47 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Written
3/25/13

Hi Cynthia,

I'm sending this to tell you that my husband and I are in favor of conveyance bill HB6672 section 10. Land that is given or purchased with our tax dollars for the a purpose should stay that way and not be sold or swapped to another party for their personal gain. Many people who are considering what they will do with their land are on the fence with the way things could be handled now.

Thank you,

Nancy and Ronald Borge

Dunne, Cynthia

From: . Hymander <hymander@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:57 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672-IN FAVOR

Written
3/25/13

IN FAVOR of Sec 10 of HB6672

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Boardman House <info@boardmanhouse.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672-IN FAVOR

Written
3/25/13

We are IN FAVOR of Sec 10 of **HB6672**

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Susannah Griffin <zannadoo@live.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 1:17 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: In Favor of HB6672 Sec 10

Written
3/25/13

Dear Ms. Dunne,

Please add my voice to the debate: I am in **Favor of HB6672 Sec 10.**

I do not like the idea that a group or organization or any government agency can "over turn" the wishes of those who donate land for open space.

Sincerely,

Susannah Griffin

Dunne, Cynthia

From: J. PALLERIA <jpalleria@prodigy.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672 Dec 10

Cynthia - Although I have not been active in the land swap - as an East Haddam resident I applaud your efforts and thank you for your challenging the big guys. Keep up the good work. I just want to encourage to continue the good fight. Joe

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: HerKatGoes@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 3:03 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Dear Cynthia.

As lifelong residents and voters of Haddam,CT my husband Robert and I are in favor of Sec 10 HB6672-we need to end this Land Swap fiasco for good!

Sincerely,

Robert C Harlow Sr

Victoria Harlow

940 Saybrook Road, Box 24

Haddam,CT 06438

860-345-4610

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Sharon Daly <bluebirdmultimedia@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 5:53 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672 *per 10*

Please count me in as someone who wants the Haddam Land Swap issue taken off the books.

Thank you,
Sharon Daly
80 Camp Bethel Rd.
Haddam, CT

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Mimi Rich <cmrich2500@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: .HB6672, Section 10

Written
3/25/13

WRITTEN TESTIMONY RE: HB6672

I am gratified to see that the legislature's GAE has included repeal of the proposed "Haddam Land Swap" in Section 10 of HB 6672.

This brief section rights a wrong – swapping public land for private. It also ensures that future generations can have confidence that land entrusted to the state for the public good will remain available to the public.

I strongly urge you to vote in favor of including Section 10 in this year's Land Conveyance Bill, HB6672.

Margaret H. Rich
Middletown

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Isabelle Seggerman <bonsaldouglas@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 8:59 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

To whom it may concern:

REGARDING HB6672

Sec 10

We are in favor of it and support it.

Isabelle D. Seggerman
Haddam, CT 06438

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Alan Aronow <aaronow@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

sect 10

Please invalidate the original legislation authorizing the Land Swap.

Respectfully,
A. Aronow
Haddam, CT

**Written
3/25/13**

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Linda Bireley <LindaBiota@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 12:06 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672-IN FAVOR

To: GAE committee

Please vote in favor of Sec 10 of HB6672

Linda Bireley
60 Mount Archer Rd
Lyme CT 06371
860 434 9864 (h)
860 884 3830 (c)

**Written
3/25/13**

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Nancy Meyers <nmeyers68@wesleyan.edu>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 12:12 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672 *see 10*

We are very much in favor of this bill which will repeal the Haddam Land Swap Amendment. It should never have been passed in the first place. We are lucky it did not work out.

But, we need to get it off the books so that there is no precedent set for things like this to happen again in Haddam or in any other part of the state.

Sincerely, Nancy and John Meyers

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: MICHAEL O'BRIEN <prezcsea@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 1:48 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672 ¹⁰

Ms Dunne,

My name is Michael J. O'Brien. I am a retired sanitary engineer who worked 35 +/- years for the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (nowDEEP).

I write today to lend my voice in favor of HB 6672 with particular attention to the section dealing with eliminating the Haddam Land Swap provision. I opposed that legislation from the very beginning as being very bad public policy. Please convey my opinion to the members of the GAE committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael J. O'Brien
154 McTigh Road
Higganum, CT 06441-4420
860-345-0013

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: George & Luella Landis <gwla620@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Dear Ms. Dunne:

This letter is being written to express my opinion concerning our public lands. I am STRONGLY in favor of Section 10 of HB6672.

Sincerely yours,

Luella D. Landis, M.Ed.
16 Prospect Hill Rd.
Cromwell, CT 06416

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Robert Estep <ehguy11@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 4:03 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672-IN FAVOR

- see ID

Please be notified that I am IN FAVOR of HB6672. It is time to close the book on this BAD deal (aka: Haddam Land Swap) once and for all.

Thank you.

Robert L. Estep
East Haddam, CT

Written
3/25/13



*Connecticut Chapter
645 Farmington Ave.
Hartford, Connecticut 06105
www.connecticut.sierraclub.org
Martin Mador, Legislative Chair*

Government Administration and Elections Committee
March 25, 2013

Testimony In Favor of
HB 6672 AAC The Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land (Section 10)

I am Martin Mador, 130 Highland Ave., Hamden, CT 06518. I am the volunteer Legislative Chair and Political Chair for the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club. I hold a Masters of Environmental Management degree from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

The Sierra Club regards Section 10 of HB 6672 as highly appropriate for 2013. We thank the committee for including this repealer section in the bill, and strongly recommend its passage.

**Written
3/25/13**

Dunne, Cynthia

*6672
June 10*

From: kennethmrobbins@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 9 17 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB6672 Sect 10

I wish to go on record as STRONGLY supporting the repeal of the Haddam land swap legislation. The swap is unequal, unfair to Connecticut citizens, and violates the intent and, frankly, the need, as expressed in the original owner's bequeath of this land. The beautiful and invaluable river front land must remain as a public trust for all Connecticut citizens to enjoy now and in the future.

Ken
860-930-9332

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Barbra-Jean Male <barbra-jean@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: ◦ Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

Hallon

I know the bill is coming up this morning and hope you will vote for the passage . I already thought that whole area along the river was protected already and was dismayed when that land grab came up.

Thank you for your help.

Barbra-jean Male
42 Camp Bethel Rd

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: John Hall <hall.john987@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

HB6672-IN FAVOR

I support permanent repeal of the Haddam Land Swap provision in last year's Land Conveyance Bill.

Thank you.

John C. Hall
555 Main Street
Portland CT 06480
860-342-1780
860-398-3771 mobile

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Patrick Lacy <dodgeboyzs@att net>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 6:40 AM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony - HB6672-IN FAVOR

Dear Cynthia,

Please accept this note as being in favor of adding Section 10 to the land conveyance bill.

Thank you.

Patrick Lacy
P.O. Box 273
Moodus, CT 06469

Written
3/25/13

Testimony for Public Hearing
GAE Committee
March 25, 2013

Sharon Botelle
81 Bridge Rd
Haddam, CT 06438

HB 6672 Sec 10

I am submitting this testimony **in favor** of HB6672.Sec 10

The original bill 1196 Sec 8 did not provide for a permanent closure of the process when the developer pulled out of the deal. This current legislature will provide that **final closure** to permanently repeal the Haddam Land Swap amendment that had been passed during the original 2011 legislative session.

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Kathleen Sullivan <ktsullivan51@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 1:13 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

No need to review all the reasons beyond renewing confidence in our government. This was a sad chapter best put behind us--permanently.

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Madeleine Winans <mavrw@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 1:34 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB662 - IN FAVOR

HB662

This letter is in support of the above legislation. Public land is a public trust, and should not be sold off to developers after having been purchased with taxpayer money as property to be conserved.
Madeleine A. Winans
Chester, CT

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Tom <ptomsly@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 2:06 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672

In favor of HB6672

phillip sylvester
387 high street
middletown ct 06457

*Middle town
Section 6?*

**Written
3/25/13**

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Barrie Robbins-Pianka <barrettrp@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2013 12:47 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB 6672 Section 6

Honorable Committee Members:

I am writing in support of SECTION 6 of this conveyence Bill, granting a conservation easement to the DEEP for the DMHAS lands in the watershed of the Connecticut Valley Hospital reservoirs in Middletown. This action will help ensure permanent conservation of these resources for the all the citizens of the State of Connecticut. Secluded and undervalued, these lands are part of a large unfragmented forest adjacent to the Connecticut River known as "Maromas". Protecting this area now is important in consideration of today's omnipresent pressures for economic development and for tomorrow's demands for clean air and water.

Thank you for your service to the State of Connecticut.
Sincerely,

Barrett S. Robbins-Pianka

1866 Saybrook Rd.
Middletown, CT 06457

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: ML Trust <mltooffice@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 10:18 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: Bill 6672 Testimony
Attachments: 130324 Ltr Public Hearing [CT Bill 6672.pdf](#)

Written
3/25/13

Date: March 24, 2013

To: The Committee on Government Administration and Elections
From: David M. Brown, Executive Director, Middlesex Land Trust
For: Public Hearing, March 25, 2013
RE: Bill 6672 AAC The Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land
Testimony in Support

Dear Sen. Anthony Musto and Rep. Ed Jutila, Chairmen, and Honored Members of the Committee:

The Middlesex Land Trust strongly **supports Bill 6672 and the intent of Section Six** to permanently protect the reservoirs and watersheds located on the property of the Connecticut Valley Hospital through the grant of a Conservation Easement to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

The Middlesex Land Trust is particularly concerned about the vulnerability of these important and precious resources. Should this property be left unprotected they would surely come under intense economic development pressure to the great detriment of the people of Connecticut. The protection of this prime open space must be ensured.

This beautiful and critical landscape, located within the area known as Maromas, is not only an important source of clean water (perhaps the most important natural resource for the future), but is also important for wildlife and the environment as one of the largest forest blocks in the region. It is also one of the most beautiful areas of Middletown, and many would say in the state. We strongly support the effort to protect this irreplaceable land with a Conservation Easement.

The Middlesex Land Trust is a membership supported conservation organization serving Northern Middlesex County, with a service area of over 95,000 people or about 39,000 households. The land trust's mission is to preserve and protect open space, important landscapes and other critical natural resources in Northern Middlesex County, and to ensure that they remain open for the enjoyment and benefit of future generations.

The Middlesex Land Trust would be pleased to assist in the effort to preserve these critical and vulnerable resources in any way possible.

Sincerely,

David M. Brown
Executive Director
Middlesex Land Trust
27 Washington Street
Middletown, CT 06457
Tel: (860) 343-7537
dbrown@middlesexlandtrust.org

Regarding: HB-6672, Section 6

March 22, 2013

Dear Committee Members,

This letter is in support of HB-6672, Section 6

An easement held by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection over the Connecticut Valley Hospital Watershed Lands is definitely needed to ensure the permanent protection of these reservoirs and natural resources in southern Middletown.

Although these lands are not presently in danger of development, we are very concerned about development in the future if the reservoirs are no longer in use. By DEEP holding the easement over the Connecticut Valley Watershed lands, we believe their permanent protection will be guaranteed. The preservation of these lands will also contribute to important habitat preservation of Maromas, an almost 3000 acre unfragmented forest.

Multiple environmental organizations consider this area of Middletown worthy of protection. It can boast besides multiple, varied, large and undisturbed habitats, a wildlife corridor and an almost unspoiled, beautiful landscape.

Some of these watershed lands that HB-6672 will protect are also bordered by already preserved lands.

Thank you and sincerely,

Ellen Lukens
46 Pine St.
Middletown
CT. 06457

Written
3/25/13

Testimony of John C. Hall
Executive Director, the Jonah Center for Earth and Art
P.O. Box 854
Middletown CT 06457

Section 6

To the Government Administration and Elections Committee
March 25, 2013

1,500

I am writing in regard to Raised Bill 6672 in support of the provision that would establish permanent conservation of the lands surround the reservoirs in the Maromas section of Middletown. The property in question comprises approximately 500 acres and is currently owned by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS). In particular, I urge all members of the Connecticut General Assembly to support the provision of Bill 6672 that would grant a conservation easement for these lands to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection.

The area of Middletown known as Maromas remains a virtually pristine wilderness area of our city. The reservoirs have spectacular beauty, surrounded as they are by hills, rock outcroppings, mature hardwood forest, and a profusion of mountain laurel beneath the canopy. The land around the reservoirs is a very special hiking area, with many long and short loop trails available for hikers of all ages and abilities. Needless to say, this whole area is a valuable outdoor resource not just for the people of Middletown but for residents of surrounding communities and the whole region.

While I have no reason to believe that Connecticut Valley Hospital (CVH) currently has plans to sell land around the 6 reservoirs for development, it is for that very reason that I urge our General Assembly and Governor to protect this land now, before pressures develop that would endanger this scenic recreational area. Future generations should be assured of access to the trails around the reservoirs, even if CVH and DMHAS decide at some point not to use the reservoirs as a source of water for the hospital.

I strongly endorse permanent protection from development of the reservoir lands that are the subject of the "Land Title Report, Southerly Watershed Properties, Connecticut Valley Hospital 1866-2007", as prepared by Attorney John E. Hudson.

The Jonah Center for Earth and Art is a grassroots environmental education and advocacy nonprofit based in Middletown, with strong ties to Wesleyan University and the City of Middletown. We are grateful for the work done by a partner organization AMP (A Maromas Plan) that has taken a leadership role in this effort.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Hall

Written
3/25/13

Dunne, Cynthia

From: Katchen Coley <katchencoley@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2013 12:32 PM
To: Dunne, Cynthia
Subject: HB 6672, Section 6

Written
3/25/13

To: Honorable Committee Members

From: Katchen Coley

Re: HB 6672, Section 6

I am writing in strong support of the inclusion in this land conveyance Bill of the beautiful reservoirs at Connecticut Valley Hospital (CVH) in Middletown. It would give the easement on these scenic areas to the Ct. Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) where the preservation of publicly-owned natural resources properly belongs.

A group of us in Middletown has long worried about what would happen to these important water resources and their surrounding scenic shores if the State ever decided to sell. After seeing the threats to the environment proposed by various would-be developers after Norwich Hospital was shed by the State, we feared that some day in the future these important CVH lands might suffer the same fate. They are not only important as a source of drinking water, but they are the most beautiful areas of Middletown, and no doubt would be the desirable site for future MacMansions.

Although there is no threat to them at the present time, their protection must be ensured. Since the DEEP has been charged by the Assembly with the oversight of Connecticut's most important natural resources and scenic areas, it is proper that this Bill will place easements on the reservoirs under that agency.

I therefore ask you to support HB 6672, Section 6 when you consider it Monday.



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
2800 BERLIN TURNPIKE, P.O. BOX 317546
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06131-7546



Office of the
Commissioner

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Public Hearing – March 25, 2013
Government Administration and Elections Committee

Testimony Submitted by Commissioner Jim Redeker
Department of Transportation

Written
3/25/13

Raised H.B. 6672 - An Act Concerning the Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land.

The Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) offers the following comments on sections of H.B. 6672, AAC the Conveyance of Certain Parcels of State Land that require the transfer of certain parcels of ConnDOT property.

Section 1 - Wethersfield

The Department transferred both parcels identified in this section to the Town of Wethersfield on January 12, 2012 for municipal purposes. It appears that the municipality would like to eliminate the deed restriction for municipal purposes and the reverter language. This language was included in the original bill to ensure that the municipality did not generate any income from property purchased with State and Federal funds.

If the language is modified to reflect no restrictions as to use, ConnDOT recommends additional language that requires the Town of Wethersfield to purchase the properties at fair market value.

Section 2 - Tolland

ConnDOT opposes this section as written and recommends the following language:

Sec. 2. (Effective from passage) (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the general statutes, the Commissioner of Transportation shall convey to the town of Tolland a parcel of land located in the town of Tolland, at a cost equal to the administrative costs of making such conveyance. Said parcel of land has an area of approximately 3.2 acres, is identified as a portion of Lot 142-61-5 on a map entitled "Connecticut Department of Transportation Right of Way Map Town of Tolland Interstate 84 From the Vernon Town Line Easterly to Cathole Road, Map No. 142-07, sheet No. 9 of 11, dated February 4, 1994", and surrounds the parcel required to be conveyed by the state pursuant to section 6 of special act 11-16. The conveyance shall be subject to the approval of the State Properties Review Board.

(b) The town of Tolland shall use said parcel of land exclusively for economic development purposes. If the Town uses said parcel for any use other than for economic development, or has not used the parcel for economic development by the end of calendar year 2020, the parcel shall revert to the State of Connecticut. If the Town sells or leases any portion of said parcel for

economic development, any consideration received by the Town of Tolland shall be transferred to the State Transportation Fund.

(c) The State Properties Review Board shall complete its review of the conveyance of said parcel of land not later than thirty days after it receives a proposed agreement from the Department of Transportation. The land shall remain under the care and control of said department until a conveyance is made in accordance with the provisions of this section. The State Treasurer shall execute and deliver any deed or instrument necessary for a conveyance under this section which deed or instrument shall include provisions to carry out the purposes of subsection (b) of this section. The Commissioner of Transportation shall have the sole responsibility for all other incidents of such conveyance.

Section 3 - Barkhamsted

This property was transferred to Regional Refuse Disposal District One on April 17, 2009 pursuant to Section 9 of Special Act 08-8. Last year, Section 148 of Public Act 12-2 amended the use and reverter restrictions.

The Department prepared a document to amend the original deed and Regional Refuse Disposal District One refused to close. Regional Refuse Disposal District One indicated that they wanted to repeal Section 148 of Public Act 12-2.

The language in this section of the bill simply changes the language back to its original form as contained in Section 9 of Special Act 08-8. ConnDOT recommends simply repealing the language added in 2012.

Section 4 - New Britain

The Department concurs with this section as written.

Section 5 - Southington

After consulting with the Southington Assessor regarding the parcel in question, it was determined that this parcel was transferred to the municipality under Section 5 of Public Act 96-249. The closing was held on February 16, 1999. The language in this section is not needed.

For further information or questions, please contact Pam Sucato, Legislative Program Manager for the Department of Transportation, at (860) 594-3013 or pamela.sucato@ct.gov.



145 Dennison Road
 Essex, CT 06475
 Phone: 860-581-8554
 FAX: 860-581-8543
www.ctrivergateway.org

Chester
 Deep River
 East Haddam
 Essex
 Haddam
 Lyme
 Old Lyme
 Old Saybrook

March 21, 2013

Written
3/25/13

Senator Anthony J. Musto, Co-Chairman (S-22)
 Representative Edward Jutila, Co-Chairman (037)
 Government Administrations and Elections Committee
 Room 2200, Legislative Office Building
 Hartford, CT 06106

SUBJECT: Support for Inclusion of Section 10 within Raised House Bill No. 6672 Concerning the Repeal of Section 8 of Special Act 11-16

Dear Chairmen Musto and Jutila:

On behalf of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission, it is requested that this letter of testimony be included in the record of the hearing on March 25, 2013 for raised House Bill No. 6672, the "Conveyance Bill". The Gateway Commission, a legislatively-empowered regional organization authorized under Sections 25-102a through 25-102s of the Connecticut General Statutes, is responsible for the protection of the "*natural and traditional riverway scene*" in the lower Connecticut River. The Gateway Commission states for the record that it is strongly in favor of the inclusion of Section 10 in raised House Bill No. 6672. Section 10 of HB No. 6672, if passed, will repeal Section 8 of Special Act 11-16, a section concerning the conveyance of 17.40 acres of land in the Tylerville section of Haddam near the Connecticut River.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

For the Commission,

J. H. Torrance Downes
 Senior Planner
 Lower CT River Valley Council of Governments

Copies via email to:
 Members of the CT River Gateway Commission

Protecting the River Since 1973



Spoken
3/25/13

FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION & ELECTIONS
TESTIMONY OF RIVERS ALLIANCE OF CONNECTICUT
Re Bill 6672, AAC The Conveyance of Certain Parcels
Public Hearing, March 25, 2013

Dear Chairmen Sen. Anthony Musto and Rep. Ed Jutila, and Members of the Committee:

Rivers Alliance of Connecticut is the statewide, non-profit coalition of river organizations, individuals, and businesses formed to protect and enhance Connecticut's waters by promoting sound water policies, uniting and strengthening the state's many river groups, and working with the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2013 Conveyance Act.

Section 6 is of particular interest to Rivers Alliance because of its focus on water supply reservoirs and the land protecting them. We strongly support this conservation effort. However, we have encountered objections by state officials to the state's holding conservation easements on state-owned lands. The proposed conveyance of an easement in Bill 6672 might illuminate or even eliminate these objections. Different officials seem to have somewhat varying views of the feasibility of state-held easements or other instruments to protect state conservation lands.

Background: The state-owned Connecticut Valley Hospital in Middletown is managed by the Department of Health, which proposes to grant easements to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) to protect the reservoirs on the property and the woodlands that buffer them. These tracts are highly important for preserving drinking water, supporting a healthy ecology, and providing opportunities for recreation. DEEP, however, has in general expressed uncertainty as to what legal means could be used to preserve state-owned conservation properties in their natural condition in perpetuity (or even for a lesser span of time). Rivers Alliance is a member of the State Lands Work Group, which has explored a number of opportunities, including deed restrictions and formal dedications filed with the land records. We would be pleased to discuss this with you in more detail.

The Hospital reservoir tracts are particularly at risk because they do not have the normal protections that come with Class I and Class II source water lands. In 2000, in connection with challenges to

UConn's expansion, Attorney General Richard Blumenthal issued a formal opinion that UConn and other state-owned water suppliers are not water companies and therefore not subject to a suite of statutes that apply to most water suppliers. Most especially their source water watersheds are not classified as Class I or Class II. That means that they can be developed as intensely as if they were private, non-drinking-water lands. This risk is heightened in the recent draft of the state POCD, which deletes the policy of a minimum of two-acre zoning in source-water watersheds that are not owned by a water company.

It is very possible that a independent non-profit conservation organization such as Connecticut Forest & Park Association would agree to backstop the state by taking holding conservation easements if and when the state feels it cannot steward the land itself. We hope you will be active in continuing to seek a conservation solution for this land and water. We would be happy to help.

General Recommendations. The Conveyance Act looks tighter and clearer this year than in the past. Thank you. I have given present and previous members of the committee some recommendations for improvements, which I'll list briefly here.

- More notice, especially to local people and neighbors.
- Longer notice. It would be helpful to have at least a week to comment.
- A map of the area of the property.
- A copy of the application or some other documentation of who requested the conveyance for what purpose.
- More information on proposed use in all cases. For example, "For municipal purposes for a cemetery" (or sports stadium, playground, greenway, etc.)
- More information on existing use. For example, Wildlife Management Area.
- An affirmation that a conveyance, even if very small, does not open access to significant changes in a property's use either directly or indirectly, say, by increasing frontage. The prime case here is the tiny Conveyance Act swap in Madison that opened the Griswold Airport property (adjacent to Hammonasset Beach) to development. This was very costly to cure.

Section 2 relates to Tolland. Enviros have been criticized for not raising more objections to Tolland conveyances in the past. I am still not familiar with the Tolland issues. It's all up to you.

Section 4 involves fairly large pieces of property and a conservation easement. We would like the chance to learn more about the easement (and the purpose of the transactions).

Section 8 relates to the extremely important Southbury Training School, but does not seem to be part of the conveyance to Southbury Land Trust (HB 6542). I have not been able to reach my Representative, Art O'Neill, over the weekend to find out if he is OK with this.

Section 10. Thank you.

Margaret Miner, Executive Director, rivers@riversalliance.org 203-788-5161 Litchfield, CT



Town of Wethersfield**Department of Public Works**

505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, CT 06109

Phone (860) 721-2850 FAX. (860) 721-2843

**Spoken
3/25/13**

To: Government Administration and Elections Committee
CC: Jeff Bridges, Town Manager
From: Michael J. Turner, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer
Date: March 25, 2013
Subject: HB 6672 Conveyance Bill
Land Transfers for Middletown Av/Spring St DOT project #159-171

The State of CT recently conveyed two parcels of land to the Town of Wethersfield as part of the above referenced intersection realignment project. The parcels have and were always intended to be conveyed to an abutting private property owner, Merritt Baldwin, at 225 Spring Street, but the state could not do that directly, the Town needed to be the intermediary. These conveyances were the result of **Special Act 11-16** of the General Assembly, which was passed July 8, 2011. When we asked our Town Attorney Duncan Forsyth to prepare the deeds from the Town to Baldwin, he noted the deeds from State to Town contained typical reverter language which states in section 2(b)

The town of Wethersfield shall use said parcel of land for municipal purposes. If the town of Wethersfield:

- (1) Does not use said parcel for said purposes;*
- (2) (2) Does not retain ownership of all of said parcels; or*
- (3) (3) Leases all or any portion of said parcel,*
- (4) The parcel shall revert to the State of Connecticut.*

We spoke to Ms. Christie LaBella of the CT DOT Rights of Way office and she confirmed she could not give us a release of that reversion clause nor issue an amended deed, because it was language taken from the Special Act. According to her, the Special Act needs to be amended for her to accomplish this transaction.

We think there should be a new or amended special act that correctly recognizes the transaction and the agreement that was made long ago by all parties including the State of Connecticut. In all there were 17 parcels being transferred in order to accomplish this road reconstruction project. This was really a "land swap" i.e., the Town transferred some land to the DOT, some land came from Merritt Baldwin and Morningside Condominium Association to the Town and vice versa. I further recall distinctly that in addition to getting some land back itself, the State received a benefit since it did not have to pay certain expenses to Mr. Baldwin that would have otherwise have been payable to him in connection with the State's taking. I recall that he gave the State a Waiver of Compensation in connection with this land swap.

Our Bottom line is that the Special Act 11-16 needs to be revised to delete the reverter language so that the last two agreed upon transfers can finally be completed. **We support HB 6672** and we would be happy to assist Rep. Morin and the Committee with whatever deeds/maps etc you fit to accomplish this revision.



Elderly Housing Management, Inc.

March 25, 2013

Government Administrations and Elections Committee
 Room 2200, Legislative Office Building
 Hartford, CT 06106

Attn. The Honorable Arthur O'Neill

RE Bill #6672 Section 8

Dear Representative O'Neill,

I am writing as the Management Agent for the Board of Directors of Southbury Elderly Housing Inc. and Pomperaug Senior Housing Inc (the Board), owners of Grace Meadows in support of their endeavor seeking land for the expansion of senior housing. They have identified a parcel belonging to the Southbury Training School that lends itself to current and future economic development based location and access to the necessary utilities such as water, sewer and gas lines.

The Board has partnered with New Samaritan Corporation and Elderly Housing Management, Inc in the development and management of four phases of senior housing funded through both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The shared mission of our agencies is to develop and maintain quality affordable housing for low income seniors. The properties are maintained to the highest standards in accordance with HUD and USDA requirements meeting all aspects of regulatory compliance, physical maintenance and fiscal stability. However, the owner and management do not stop at meeting those benchmarks but have created homes where residents have access to supportive services within the community that enable them to age in place successfully and with dignity. We recognize that individual quality of life is part of creating good homes.

I have served with Elderly Housing Management for more than twenty years, over fifteen of them as the Administrator of the Grace Meadows complex. Each of the individual phases at Grace Meadows maintain waiting lists which average 175 applicants per community which translates to an average wait of three years or more. As a Senior Regional Manager overseeing more than 500 units of affordable senior housing I can attest to the continued growing as we face the retirement of the baby boomer generation with 10,000 people turning 65 every day for the next twenty years. I ask for your support of that portion of Raised House Bill 6672 which would convey that parcel of land to the Town of Southbury for the purpose of creating affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Boger
 Senior Regional Manager
 Elderly Housing Management, Inc

Elderly Housing Management, Inc.
 127 Washington Avenue, Fifth Floor East, North Haven, CT 06473
 Phone: 203.230.4809 · Fax: 203.230.3628 · www.ehmchm.org





State of Connecticut
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

Spoken
3/25/13

Line Number 26

Page Number 7

REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP MILLER
THIRTY-SIXTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4011
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

CAPITOL 860-240-8585
TOLL FREE 1-800-842-8267
E-MAIL Philip.Miller@cga.ct.gov

VICE CHAIR
PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

MEMBER
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

March 25, 2013

Senator Musto, Representative Jutila, leadership and members of Government Administration and Elections,

I'm Representative Philip Miller of the 36th House district and I'd like to testify in support of two sections of #6672, the conveyance act.

Section 6 would give easement to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection of the area uphill of Connecticut Valley Hospital (CVH) Longtime local conservationists as well as the city of Middletown have long advocated for this property, which includes several pristine reservoirs which sit on top of an outstanding groundwater aquifer.

Section 10 would formally close the ill-fated Haddam Land Swap of two years ago. This deal caused great unrest and resentment because it was seen somehow bypassing local scrutiny. The proponent of the deal included a circuit breaker which had nullified things when independent appraisals subsequently revealed a large disparity in value.

I'd be glad to close this divisive chapter and get on with progress which the town of Haddam is making.

Thank you and I'd be glad to answer questions.

Sincerely,

Phil Miller – 36th District

Spoken
3/25/13

RE: House Bill # 6672, Section 10

which states only that "Section 8 of special act 11-16 is repealed"

June 24
Page 27

Good afternoon chairs and members of the GAE committee. My name is Steve Rocco and I am one of the partners of The Riverhouse Banquet and Conference Center in Haddam. I am here to ask you to please delete Section 10 of Bill #6672, known as the "Conveyance Bill".

Section 10 of this year's Conveyance Bill asks to repeal Section 8 of Special Act 11-16, the 2011 Conveyance Bill, which authorized the property exchange between Riverhouse and the State of Connecticut, aka the "Haddam Land Swap". I am the person who has been most involved with this proposal from the start, and after 6 years of work, thousands of hours of time spent, many thousands of dollars spent, and close examination and approval by the Legislature, I do not want to see this arbitrarily repealed. Section 10 doesn't mention what it is repealing, nor who submitted it, nor is there anything in the committee clerk's file as to why it should be repealed. It should not be. This has been thoroughly vetted and debated through three legislative sessions, and then duly approved in overwhelming numbers. Because of all the attention, the Governor drove to Haddam to inspect the two properties personally before signing the bill and declared that the deal seemed fair to him. And the fact is that this was first proposed to us by the DEP Deputy Commissioner in 2005 as a way for the State to improve the quality of its holdings. That began a 6 year odyssey which culminated in the approval in 2011. All of this effort should not just suddenly be made to disappear by one anonymous line in a bill two years later.

I won't take you through all of the details of this proposal, unless you ask me to. But the Land Swap was the subject of much discussion and a great deal of misleading, factually incorrect publicity. There were lengthy public hearings during which much testimony offered. There was an in-depth review of maps and photos of the properties in both the House and the Senate. In the end, the measure was supported overwhelmingly, across party lines. It was approved because the state property is a former sand pit adjacent to the Riverhouse, overrun with invasive plants, surrounded by commercial and industrial development, isolated and far removed from any other open space corridors. The 87 acre parcel is pristine forest land, which would add to and strategically connect Cockaponsett State Forest with Route 81 in Higganum. It would also connect Haddam Land Trust property to this 16,000 acre greenbelt, which is why the Land Trust supported it. If you want to get a sense of the conclusion the supportive legislators came to after looking into the matter in depth, I invite you to watch the video of Senate President Don

Williams' remarks to open the discussion in 2011. He questioned why "his friends in the environmental community" had misled him about the facts of this matter, and he gave detailed reasons for his strong support for it.

After the bill was signed by the Governor, we began working with DEEP staff to complete the exchange. Appraisals were ordered by DEEP of the two properties and in early 2012 the DEEP informed us that the values were unexpectedly far apart. I say unexpectedly because the properties were appraised in 2009 when Commissioner McCarthy was in office and supported the exchange. At that time our property was valued slightly higher than the State's 17 acres. But in the new appraisals, the value of our property was cut in half, largely based on erroneous information, while the State's property inexplicably went up by 60 percent, during the worst real estate market since the Great Depression. Without the benefit of being able to review the appraisals, we were given a one week deadline by DEEP staff to inform them if we were going to make up this new 1.3 million dollar difference in cash or additional property. We had no choice to decline, but we reserved our right to challenge the appraisals after we saw them.

We reviewed the appraisals and found they contained errors regarding important facts and highly questionable comparable properties, such as properties on I95 in Waterford, 30 miles away, with zoning approvals for large projects already in place. Our attorney sent a 255 page document to DEEP outlining the problems with the appraisals, but in the end the appraisers declined to revise them. Subsequently, we hired the original appraiser from 2009 to review these appraisals, and his conclusion was that the values should have been within \$200,000 of each other. I have a copy of his analysis for the committee.

At this point my partners and I have not come to an agreement as to whether or not to pursue the exchange again. Our business is holding celebrations and conferences, generally a happy and upbeat endeavor. But this process has been anything but that. Still, the 17 acres surround the Riverhouse on three sides, and as DEEP has no money to care for the property, it is becoming a forest of weed trees. So for that reason alone, it is still important to pursue this. Beyond that it is impossible to say without a lot of work what the economy and the area will support. So, to reiterate, I respectfully request that you remove Section 10 from House Bill 6672. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Government Administrations and Elections Committee
Room 2200, Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

Testimony IN FAVOR of HB6672 and HB1146

OPPOSED to HB1148

March 25, 2013

HB6672 – IN FAVOR

Senator Musto, Representative Jutilla and members of the GAE committee,

Thank you for your continued efforts to serve the citizens of Connecticut. I would like to write in SUPPORT of HB 6672, this year's conveyance bill. This bill will finally put to rest a very bad policy that dates back to 2009.

Section 10 of HB6672 would repeal the "Haddam land swap." This repeal will bring with it a return of faith in our public officials to protect the conservation land along the river that makes our state beautiful.

I hope that land set aside for conservation will never again be traded as surplus land.

HB1146 – IN FAVOR

It is very difficult to start a third party and keep active membership up, nonetheless run a candidate. A party that does the work to run their own candidate should not be competing with a major party candidate who is also cross endorsed on another line or even more than one line. I believe HB1146 is a start in making a fairer process of a very unfair election system in Connecticut.

As the Green party candidate for the 33rd district senate seat in the 2012 election, I have learned firsthand that the public financing and petitioning process is prohibitively unfair to minor parties.

To have a major party candidate also listed as a cross endorsed candidate on the "Independent" party line or any other third party line is even more difficult to compete with in the already unfair process.

I hope in the future you will make the Citizens Election Program fairer as well and much more inclusive for all parties.

HB1148 – OPPOSED

H - 1180

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL.56
PART 31
10451 - 10795**

law/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

405
June 5, 2013

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS (27th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we waive the reading of the list of bills and that it be tabled for the Calendar.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Without objection the items are tabled for the Calendar. Let's return to the Call of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call Calendar.

THE CLERK:

On page 13, Mr. Speaker, Calendar number 426 favorable report of the joint standing Committee on Government, Administration and Elections, substitute House Bill 6672, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCELS OF STATE LAND.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

It is always a pleasure, Representative Fritz, to have you bring out this bill because it's the beginning of the end. Representative Fritz please.

REP. FRITZ (90th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And good evening.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good evening.

law/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

406
June 5, 2013

REP. FRITZ (90th):

And I recognize that fact as well. I move acceptance of the committee's fine report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the bill please, Ma'am.

REP. FRITZ (90th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an amendment, number 8793. If he would please call it and I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO 8793 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A. Mr. Clerk, please call.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO 8793 introduced by Representative Jutila et al.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The Gentlewoman has asked to seek leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Fritz.

REP. FRITZ (90th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you all know this is

the annual conveyance bill. This year this bill is clearly a mulligan stew. We have properties from DOT from DAS, from DEEP, from corrections. Additionally we have two repealers and a brand new wrinkle. We have five validating acts within the framework of this bill.

We have -- the validations include Monroe, Litchfield, Stonington, New Haven and Old Saybrook. We go from Bridgeport to Barkhamsted. There are 31 legislators involved in this -- this amendment which now becomes the bill. I move adoption. I moved adoption, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question is on adoption House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule A? Representative Fritz? No. Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this bill and I want to thank the good Representative for her tremendous work on this. I also want to thank the Chair and the Ranking Senator in GAE for the work but most importantly I want to also thank all the advocates in these conveyances as well as the

cooperating agencies. It is a win-win situation and I thank the good work of Miss Fritz as well. Thank you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, Sir. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule A? Will you remark on House Amendment Schedule A? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.
The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please come to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally. And the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Substitute for House Bill 6672 as amended by
House A.

Total Number Voting	146
Necessary for Adoption	74
Those voting aye	146
Those voting nay	0
Absent and not voting	4

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The bill as amended is passed. Representative
Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good evening, Sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we immediately transmit
all matters requiring further action to the Senate.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Without objection, so ordered. House will stand
at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL. 56
PART 17
5161 - 5482**

House Bill 6672, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCELS OF STATE LAND.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

If the clerk would call that item?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

House Bill Number 6672, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCELS OF STATE LAND, favorable report of the committee on Government Administration and Elections.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Musto.

SENATOR MUSTO:

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening again, sir.

SENATOR MUSTO:

Madam President, I would move the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House as they've just amended it.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage in concurrence.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MUSTO:

Yes, Madam President. Thank you.

This is our standard conveyance bill. It has several provisions where land is being conveyed from the state to various municipalities. It has some -- excuse me -- validations in it as well of things that have been done in the past and it needs State approval. And, that's really about it. It's something that I think has so many sponsors on you can't even read them all, it would take too long so I would just ask for the Chamber's support for this item.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark?

Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES:

Thank you, Madam President.

I'd like to talk about a section of this bill, which impacts my district. It's language -- it's language which permanently repeals the 2011 law that has come to be known as the Haddam Land Swap. It's an issue I feel very strongly about. It's an issue that people I represent feel strongly about, and I am pleased that this repeal language is in the bill before us today.

Just to refresh everyone's memory about the 2011 land swap law, it provided that the State could enter into an even swap of 17.4 acres of state-owned wildlife management area in Haddam for an 87-acre tract of woodland adjacent to the state forest in Higganum owned by a private developer.

I know many of you feel, as I do, that the Connecticut River is one of the most beautiful rivers in the world. The state's 17.4 acre of land in the swap overlooks Eagle's Landing State Park. A short

distance away you have an amazing view of the Haddam Swing Bridge and the historic Goodspeed Opera House.

During the 2011 land swap debate, Senator McKinney asked why the State had not taken a position on the swap. Senator Meyer also questioned why the deal had not been vetted by the State, and Senator Meyer also asked why the swap had not been examined to see if the State would be getting a fair share value in the trade. Many of my constituents were concerned about the swap and that it would set a precedent. A precedent that would undermine the principle of our conservation policies. After it passed that 2011 law was met with disappointment in the towns I represent.

Conservationists were upset, sportspeople were upset. People from all walks of life were disappointed. And that disappointment centered around what can be summed up in two words: the process. It was an example of insider politics gone bad. Many citizens of Haddam and surrounding towns felt and still feel disenfranchised, and I give a tremendous amount of credit to the environmentalists, conservationists for having the courage to speak out. Some people called the deal a scarlet letter on the State's environmental record and they were absolutely right.

The 2011 Haddam land swap was irresponsible. The process was not followed. The people's voice was taken away. That's not democracy, and we are better than that. Today we have a chance to make it right. Today we have an opportunity to restore the public's faith. Today we can permanently repeal the land swap. Again, on behalf of many and many residents in the 33rd District Senate, I thank you for including this repeal language and I'm asking my fellow senators for their vote in favor of this measure. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not -- sorry.

Senator Musto.

SENATOR MUSTO:

If not, Madam President, I would ask this item be placed on our consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR MUSTO:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

If we might stand at ease for just a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would call as the next item, one previously marked go, and it is from Calendar page 8, Calendar 601, House Bill 6490, the bill from the Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if the clerk would now call -- would now list the items on the Consent Calendar so that we might proceed to a vote on the Consent Calendar before taking up additional items.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 2 -- sorry -- House Bill 6672, and then on page 2, Calendar 423, House Bill 5907.

On page 4, Calendar 464, House Bill 5601; Calendar 465, House Bill 6630.

On page 5: 485, House Bill 6602; Calendar 503, House Bill 6635.

On page 6: Calendar 19, House Bill 5903; Calendar 522, House Bill 5598.

On page 7: Calendar 570, House Bill 6486; Calendar 571, House Bill 6492.

On page 8: Calendar 601, House Bill 6490; Calendar 606, House Bill 6674.

On page 10, Calendar 644, House Bill 6363.

On page 12, Calendar 668, House Bill 6362; and Calendar 672, House Bill 548.

On page 15: Calendar 695, House Bill 5289; Calendar 696, House Bill 6658.

On page 16: Calendar 704, House Bill 6692; 705, House Bill 6703.

On page 17: Calendar 706, House Bill 6651.

And on page 21: Calendar 431, Senate Resolution Number 15.

HB 5480

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please announce the pendency of a roll call vote, the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the chamber. Immediate roll call on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members have voted? If all members have voted, please check the board to make sure your vote is accurately recorded.

If all members have recorded, the machine will be closed and the clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

The second Consent Calendar

Total Number Voting	35
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 2 passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I just wanted to review and have we adopted Senate Agendas 3 and 4?

THE CHAIR: