



Connecticut Business & Industry Association

**TESTIMONY OF
ERIC J. BROWN
CONNECTICUT BUSINESS & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (CBIA)
BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 23, 2011**

Good morning. My name is Eric Brown and I serve as associate counsel with the Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA). CBIA represents roughly ten thousand small and large businesses throughout Connecticut employing hundreds of thousands of Connecticut citizens.

CBIA strongly opposes the proposed changes in section 2 of Committee Bill No. 210, An Act Prohibiting the use of Bisphenol-A in Thermal Receipt Paper and Increasing the Increasing the Duties of the Chemical Innovations Institute.

CBIA worked diligently with advocates and this committee to reach a compromise on the original bill first proposed just last year. We made it clear that the most important issue for us was that the Institute not be directly involved in advocacy.

Specifically, our public hearing testimony stated:

“HB-5126 hints at an approach that could help further these goals. Part of the stated goal of the institute proposed in the bill would be to ‘provide assistance to businesses, state agencies and nonprofit organizations that seek to utilize safe alternatives to chemicals that are harmful to public health and the environment.’ However, CBIA has serious concerns that the concept could easily result in an organization that is more interested in identifying chemicals of concern and involving itself in public policy efforts to ban or otherwise legislate those chemicals, all at the expense of some new mandated fee on industry.”

Further, Tim Morris, the principal architect of the Institute idea stated in his testimony:

“Connecticut manufacturers need to be aware of the regulations and be able to access safer alternatives to chemicals in order to successfully export products.

“We anticipate that a “Chemical Innovations Institute at UConn Health Center will be helpful for the transition to safer alternatives through (1) providing expertise in relation to current and future chemical policy changes through integration with national and international networks, including the Interstate Chemical Clearinghouse, (2) providing training to Connecticut businesses and workers on chemical assessment and evaluation of

safer alternatives, (3) providing a linkage to green chemistry efforts to develop safer alternatives, and (4) in helping businesses evaluate the effectiveness of the alternatives.”

The ultimate language adopted in the statute is consistent with this intent, stating that the Institute was created to be:

- “a resource for information”
- “provide research and technical assistance”
- “share information”
- “offer trainings for businesses”; and
- “assist businesses in indentifying funding to be used for the implementation of sustainable, chemical-related processes by such businesses”

In fact, the language of the bill throughout last year’s committee process included a section that stated:

“(j) The Chemical Innovations Institute shall not engage in lobbying, as defined in section 1-91 of the general statutes.”

As the bill was about to be introduced on the House floor, House legal staff advised that that language be removed as it was redundant with current law regarding lobbying by quasi-public agencies.

In introducing the bill on the House floor, Chairman Roy introduced an amendment removing the language saying of the lines containing the language, “We do not need them.”

During the floor debate in the House, Ranking Member Clark Chapin asked Chairman Roy to confirm that the purpose of those lines would “still be in tact even after we remove them because it’s addressed elsewhere in the statute. Is that correct?”

Rep. Roy responded, “Yes, that is correct.”

Accordingly, the record clearly indicates that the modification proposed in section 2 of Bill No. 210 is directly counter to the intent and purpose of the Chemical Institute. Unfortunately, some who agreed to this concept last year have chosen to return this year and try to undercut last year’s agreement.

This is very disappointing and we hope this committee will reject this effort by extracting section 2 of the bill.