

Testimony Regarding Senate Bill 103
For public hearing on 23 Feb, 2018

Tom M. Bayley, CAPT(Ret) U.S. Navy
115 Paxton Way, Glastonbury, CT
tm.bayley@gmail.com

First, I would like to establish my credentials as having subject matter expertise relating to radioactive materials. I have a Bachelor's of Science degree from Texas A&M University in Radiation Protection Engineering. Additionally, I spent 25 years as an officer in the Naval Nuclear Propulsion program. During my time in the Navy I was an Engineering Officer of a fast attack nuclear submarine (and later as a Commanding Officer). I was also a Squadron Material Officer of a fast attack submarine squadron which included 7 nuclear submarines which I had oversight for their nuclear propulsion systems. I was also on the Radioactive Crisis Response Team for Pearl Harbor and have been involved in the supervision and oversight of several nuclear incidents involving radioactive material.

I would like the committee to base their deliberations on facts, recognizing there are emotional issues related to perceptions and lack of familiarity on the subject. Just the following promotion is an example of appealing to people's fears and emotions without providing any of the facts:



Having been responsible for many years in the Navy for the safe handling of radioactive materials (as well as hazardous materials) I fully acknowledge there are risks involved. That is

to say, these deliberations should balance the risks with the benefits while mitigating the risks appropriately.

From my research on fracking wastes, the radioactive contamination levels are low level wastes. As such, they pose little threat IF properly handled and exposure is minimized. In fact, you might even find the same levels of radioactivity from earth being excavated for a new building or parking lot due to natural materials in the earth (where the fracking waste is getting it from). Water tables already permeate some of this same ground.

As for the other chemicals, again, they must be controlled properly. By establishing the proper handling controls to address storing, transporting, and disposing of these materials WITH the resources to enforce the regulations, I firmly believe that wastes can be safely controlled. The added costs for strictly enforcing these standards must be developed and evaluated in considering the decision to permit these wastes to be handled in Connecticut. Without enforcement, then the regulations have little meaning.

These costs in developing standards, enforcing, and perhaps even preparing response plans in the event of an incident must be weighed to the benefit of fracking. Licensing fees should be valued accordingly to address added costs such that this becomes a business decision for the companies involved. If the price to do business in Connecticut is too high then they will be faced to look for alternatives. Otherwise, the State has the potential to generate additional revenue while minimizing risks to the environment and its residents while also generating added revenue. This can be safely managed with proper regulations and enforcement.

As such, I strongly encourage you to hear from experts in the fields involved (e.g. environmental protection, waste management, hazardous materials, economists, etc.) to support an informed debate on this subject and take some of the science panic away which focuses on "radioactivity". I also request you fully consider the benefits versus the risks and make your decision accordingly.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Bayley