

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
RE: HB 5462

Dear Committee,

I am a marina owner in Mystic.
I also am an owner of a Marine Construction Company in Mystic
I feel this gives me a broad perspective on this issue

Please do not vote in favor of, support, or endorse HB 5462. There is one components of it that is very troubling, the proposed ban on pressure treated lumber for dock pilings and lumber.

Until there is a viable, affordable alternative to traditional C.C.A. treated lumber and pilings, the banning of it is extremely shortsighted and hasty. There is no such product known to me which meets these criteria.

The most common and available alternative currently is a product known as GREENHEART piling which comes from the rainforests of South America. It is very expensive, hard to get and is not plentiful enough to act as a substitute. Also depletion of the rainforest is a proven hazard to the environment. Southold County, NY bans the use of CCA decking and this works because there are alternative, affordable decking materials. I would urge the Committee to see what other states are doing in the NORTHEAST US in regard to this issue. To my knowledge there have never been any recent, unbiased, comprehensive studies done by any party to evaluate the effect of pressure treated lumber on the water or the environment. It was banned on decks and playgrounds because of the worries of some people that a splinter would transfer the CCA to the person receiving the splinter. Although I have never heard of someone dying from a CCA splinter, they do tend to get red and puffy if the splinter isn't promptly removed. In the marine environment, CCA is present to resist marine borers, which are like aquatic termites. I can tell you without doubt that the present CCA alternative (ACQ) does not resist marine borers as I have seen it myself. So if ACQ is used we will merely be throwing away more lumber in greater quantities, more frequently. It's like banning bottom paint on boats without a viable, affordable, and alternative.

Plastic pilings, which exist, are also not a viable alternative as there is currently one manufacturer in the entire Northeast. Also, their structural limitations make them a non alternative for many projects from an engineering perspective. I would also urge the Committee to consult with engineers to gain some insight on this issue. And plastic piling are very expensive: if you are a marina owner and it's time to replace all the pilings at your facility; your cost just went up more than double! Also keep in mind that the production of plastic piling is reliant on fossil fuels, which is also a proven hazard to the environment.

Bringing us back to CCA. Is it a proven hazard to the environment? By whom and to whom? These questions should be definitively answered before such a sweeping measure is taken. Please do not support HB 5462. I would be willing to discuss this more with anyone who is interested in this issue. 860 608 9905.

Sincerely

Gwenmor Marina, Inc.
Gwenmor Marine Contracting, Inc
Christian McGugan, V.P.