Senator Christine Cohen

Cohen, Kushner, Miner, Haskell

Arconti, Dillon, Gucker, Hayes, Kennedy, McGorty, Mushinsky, Palm, Rebimbas, Ryan, Vargas, Young, Demicco, Gresko, Harding, Borer, Dubitsky, Horn, Michel, O'Dea, Piscopo, Reyes, Simms, Wilson

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Everybody. We are going to reconvene the public hearing for Monday, March 18, 2019. As is customary, we will reserve the first hour for constitutional officers, public officials, legislators, agency heads, and first on our agenda is Branford's First Selectman, Jamie Cosgrove. Welcome.

JAMIE COSGROVE: Thank you. Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco, Members of the Environment Committee. As First Selectman, I come before you in support of S.B. No. 1062. I have submitted written testimony. I am joined today with our Finance Director, Jim Finch, who has submitted written testimony as well. However, in the interest of time, I invited Jim to sit up here with me. The town of Branford has recently created a fund which we transferred $1 million dollars from our unassigned fund balance into this fund. However, we are hoping for the passing of the proposed
legislation to realize the full maximum potential of having such a fund. With that, Jim, if you have --.

JIM FINCH: Yes. Thank you, Jamie. To back up some of the First Selectman's comments, as many of you are aware, there are various tools available to municipalities for financing coastal resiliency efforts. Traditionally, municipalities would either issue debt. They would use bonds and grants or they would set aside some money in a sinking fund. What this does is it really gives us a fourth option and that is to allow us the flexibility to invest these assets so that they can grow and I think the best way for folks on your Committee and maybe in the audience to look at this is think of it as if you were explaining to your daughter about saving for retirement.

You would basically say to her, well, I don’t know how much money you're gonna need. It depends on a lot of factors. It depends on how long you're gonna live, how much you save, what kind of return you're gonna get, and how much you're gonna spend in retirement. But, you can say with certainty, if you start today, you're gonna be vastly better off than had you done nothing, and if we apply that metaphor to this, the town of Branford, as Jamie said, has set aside a million dollars from our undesignated fund balance and we put it in a coastal resilience reserve fund. What we're doing is we're looking to invest that so that it grows and occasionally we have the option of taking some of the proceeds out for various projects, but essentially the underlying theme here is we want to be on the right side of compound interest.
We want to put some money aside. We want it to grow because the liabilities in the future associated with this are going to grow, and just like the state of Connecticut or other municipalities might use equities or longer term investments for longer term liabilities, your pension fund would be a good example, Branford's pension fund would be a good example - Branford's other postemployment benefit fund which funds legacy costs would be a good example as well. The other point I want to make here is that I had the opportunity to go to Standard & Poor’s, they had a municipal forum. They dealt with pensions, other postemployment benefit liabilities and the other thing they dealt with is what they call ESG, environmental social and governance section and when I had approached the panel and asked them the question as to who was doing something like this, I was under the distinct impression that folks weren't looking at it that way. They weren't looking at it the way one might fund a pension or fund OPEB or fund one's retirement.

And since then, they've actually kept in touch with me. About two weeks ago, a gentleman from S&P from Colorado reached out to me. They want to site Branford in one of their upcoming articles as this approach and they also asked me to keep them abreast as to where we were with the legislation and obviously that's where you folks come in. We're taking the position that Connecticut's a Dillon's Law state which means in order for us to do something, there must be enabling legislation to create the ability for us to do that as I think we're all aware, all of our municipal powers come directly from the state.
And, so we're looking for you to help us and we also think that there's some benefits to the state as well. I heard some of the other discussion about other Bills before you. Costs came up. How much did it cost the state? Is this going to help the general fund? Is it not? But, in this case I can say with certainty there is no cost to the state of Connecticut for - to you for this. You're simply enabling us to do things to help ourselves and I also think that it also makes the state of Connecticut look good, that the state of Connecticut is taking a proactive approach to help municipalities help themselves in funding these liabilities associated with climate change and coastal resilience which again are long-term liabilities and what this legislation does, it allows us to invest in a way that we can match those long-term liabilities with the appropriate investments, and being on the right side of compound interest, I think we all recognize that there's a benefit to that and it's a benefit to our taxpayers and it's a benefit to the state as well.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Finch and Mr. Cosgrove. I, as a Representative of the 12th District and Branford, just commend you both on bringing this to bear and shedding some light on the problems that we are having as a result of climate change and making sure that the towns' finances are stabilized to deal with occurrences as they come up. You mentioned SNP and certainly they're looking upon this favorable - favorably rather. Do you - are you anticipating that bond rating companies will be examining what coastal communities are doing when they are measuring and providing bond ratings?
JIM FINCH: Yes. Yes, I do. Standard imports, for example, looks at a variety of factors when rating a municipality. They'll look at the strength of your tax base, your budgeting, how you're managing your liabilities, and this new component that they're looking at, is they call it ESG which is environmental, social, and government and one of the things they are looking at is how are municipalities planning and how might they be able to adapt and so this would clearly be favorable to the town of Branford in addition to identifying the issue of coastal resilience and our planning in zoning and conservative development in addition to the COG Hazard Mitigation Study in addition to our own coastal resilience study. They're gonna look and they're gonna say, well, what sort of funding commitments are we making and is that part of our plan and I would say that the coastal resiliency fund concepts is one that they would certainly applaud.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you and you could tell me - answer a couple of questions for me. Obviously, Branford has already taken measures to establish coastal resiliency fund. Could you tell me one, why this legislation is important since we've already taken or you've already taken measures to create such a fund and also could you speak to a little bit perhaps, Mr. Cosgrove, the reception -- I know Branford functions on a RTM model, what the response has been from the residents and perhaps the RTM in Branford with respect to setting up this fund.

JAMIE COSGROVE: Sure, Senator Cohen. I'll address the reception it's received and then perhaps Mr. Finch can speak about the need for the legislation
in terms of the investments. As you mentioned, we are a Board of Selectman RTM form of government which has a Board of Finance. When we appropriated the money to establish the fund, we went through Board of Finance RTM approval. We received overwhelming support for the creation of this fund. One thing we do in town, we have a -- we do have a strong cultural position in addressing our long-term liabilities and that's really how we're approaching this, as a long-term liability.

When we put it in context as that, it receives support from, again, both sides of the aisle. Any resident I've spoken to have overwhelming been support of this. The fact that we're not debating the cause, but being a shoreline community, we see changes occurring and I'm not even speaking of just solely the -- the severe repetitive loss areas or the repetitive loss properties. There's properties in town that are being impacted and through the slight increase that we're seeing in the tide -- the sea level rise already. So, neighborhoods are being impacted and it's being addressed, so what we're approaching is, there's a liability there. We're coming up with a mechanism to address that liability.

As Mr. Finch said, this is just another tool that we have. We're still gonna bond. We're still gonna look for grants, but to have this and be on the right side of compounding interest and investing that money today and having those investments match the long-term liabilities, that will put us in a stronger position in the future. Then speaking of legislation [cross talk]
JIM FINCH: Yeah. I'll address the other benefits of the legislation. Our goal in this is one, to have greater investment flexibility for these assets that cur -- greater than what currently exists. Our examination of the statutes is that under municipal powers, I think it's 7148. Municipalities can set up a sinking fund or reserve fund. The municipal reserve fund statute talks about a 30 percent equity exposure. We're actually talking about a 50 percent exposure, and why is that important? Well, one is and I'll have people go back to the testimony, but essentially how you allocate your assets determines how fast or how slow that your money is gonna grow. I don’t know, maybe the folks in this room may be familiar with the phrase, the rule of 72. If you're not, you can have some fun with your kids with this, but essentially the rule of 72 talks about how long it takes for money to double. So, nine percent takes eight years, okay, and six percent takes 12 years. Okay? So, when you start looking at how your money's gonna double, because again you're investing for a long-term goal, you're investing for the future, you wanna try to have a high -- a higher rate of compounding or higher rate of growth. And, if I compare a 30 percent stock bond allocation, which is very similar to the 31 percent in the municipal reserve fund statute, and compare that to a 50-50 percent, the difference over a long period of time is actually quite significant.

The Vanguard Group, which is the largest mutual fund company in the United States, did a study on portfolio allocations and so from 1926 to 2017 they compared various allocation models and a 30 percent, 70 percent allocation model, basically a million dollars, would grow to $8.3 million over 30 years if
left untouched. If we go to a 50 percent equity allocation, which this statute enables us to do, that same million dollars would grow to $11.2 million and that's just the difference between a 7.3 percent rate of return and an 8.4 percent rate of return.

So, what this legislation again does, it gives us the ability to develop an asset allocation strategy similar to what a pension plan will do, similar to what other postemployment benefit trusts would do to match those future liabilities and also I think our other goal of this would be essentially if somebody else wanted to replicate what we've done in Branford, rather than have their corporation counsel or town attorney look up a lot of different statues, essentially what they would do is they would say, oh, wait a second, I read in the CCM vault and there's a coastal resiliency fund statute and they would actually look at it, they would read three pages, and they would say, yes, the town of X is able to do this.

Here's your limitations. Here's how you create it. Here's what you can use it for. So, again this presents the model that I think can be used in the future. Has it ever been done in another place? Perhaps. One of the questions I did ask when I was down in New York City at Standard & Poor’s was I asked who else has done something like this on a municipal level. And, I'm not saying it was an exhaustive group of people, but basically these are researchers, investors, and analysts and as far as I can tell, no one actually said, oh yeah, call that town in North Carolina, they're doing it; oh yeah, call this town in Virginia Beach, they're doing it. They did not. So, to me that was like proof of
concept and thinking that this might be something good that we should do in Branford and it's been well received.

Additionally, the Yale Climate Group has reached out, so Branford's gonna be in the Yale Climate Connections and that's broadcast across a number of different radio stations, so actually the response has been good. The concept's been tested in terms of what other people are thinking and in terms of endorsing what we're doing and I think the vote on the RTM was probably maybe three against. It's a 30-member body. I don’t know if everybody was there that day, but only three people actually voted against it so, --.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for your testimony. So, I'm trying to understand why this is different than let's say a town's pension plan or a merit service plan for their volunteers or an OPEB account which we can already invest to the best of my knowledge. In other words, if we wanted to do a 60/40 allocation, um, and I think you mentioned 50/50 and you said it’s not allowed so how’d you do it?

JIM FINCH: I’ll address that. I’m glad you mentioned the OPEB legislation because the last time I was before this body was back in probably 2003 advocating that we amend Statute 7-450 so that Branford could set up another postemployment benefit trust, so I’m familiar with that. But our read of this is that, you know, all the other reserve fund statutes, and this is not necessarily a pension plan
or OPEB trust plan, where you do have that flexibility, it’s a -- it’s under the reserve fund statutes and if you look at other statutes related to this, and this is my take on it. I’m by no means an expert, I bet you have folks behind you that could probably site phrase and verse, but when you look at the municipal reserve fund statute, it clearly tells you that you can invest 31% in equities. The retiree loss reserve fund statute talks about a 40% in equities. So, our thinking here is if we’re going to create enabling legislation, let’s be very clear about what this legislation does. I want it to be very clear about how -- how we could invest that. It’s not a trust fund like the pension and OPEB is where you’re investing for an exclusive benefit of participants but it has some similarities, right? They’re both funding longer term liabilities and you also have an opportunity for spending money in the near term, and that’s where the allocation comes in. So if you’re managing a pension fund, and you wanted to do sort of an asset liability analysis, what would you do is you would say, okay, the guy -- the guy I just hired who is going to retire in 30 years, I’m going to put that in the equity bucket. But the person who’s going to retire in the next let’s just say one to five years, I want to invest that in fixed income and the guiding principal with that is that you’re match -- you’re doing a matching.

So I’m matching short-term liabilities with short-term investments. Coastal resiliency also a long-term liability, I want to match that with invests that are appropriate for the long-term. And I don’t know if that answers your question.
REP. WILSON (66TH): Well, I understand conceptually. I’m just trying, in my mind figure out why a municipality can’t do this already. You did it, so how did you do it in Branford.

JAMES FINCH: Okay, what we did -- okay -- I get the question now. Essentially what we did is in many ways, I think we did the heavy lifting. We actually, and again, this just got approved in February. Okay, in Branford. We basically funded, yeah, so we put money into the fund. So right now it’s not -- it’s not doing anything other than being invested in short-term investments. What we’re looking to do is take the next step. So yes, we can set up a fund and we can put money in it for longer term things and the municipal power statute, in my read clearly allows us to do that. What this does, it says, okay, we’re taking the position that unless the State of Connecticut has enabling legislation, you know, that Dillon’s Law Concept, that we need to go to the State and we need to get permission to make those investments. And in -- and in doing so, by having it be specific. So, this reserve fund is distinguished from the other reserve funds for a couple of reasons; One, what it’s used for, coastal resiliency and climate change, and two, for the investment policy that allows you to create, which again, relates to a higher compounding rate. So right -- so when I said we were doing this. What we did was we basically got the money approved and got the money appropriated and got the money in the fund. The investing piece we have not done and that’s where the legislation comes in.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Okay, that was the answer. Thank you.
JAMES FINCH: I’m sorry. I didn’t --

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, thank you both for your time. Yeah. I just want to, before go any further, again, thank everybody for their patience. I know that we started significantly later than we had anticipated, so thank you for sticking with us and being so patient. I have, okay, next. Bryan Garcia from Connecticut Green Bank. Welcome.

BRYAN GARCIA: Good afternoon. Co-chairs Cohen and Demicco, Vice-Chair Gresko, ranking member Miner and members of the Environment Committee, good afternoon. My name is Bryan Garcia, I’m President and CEO of the Connecticut Green Bank. I am here today to express our support for the important intentions behind H.B. No. 6646 while proposing an alternative approach to advance S.B. No. 927. Since its formation in July 2011 through Public Act 1180, the Green Bank has mobilized over $1.5 billion dollars of investment into the state’s clean energy economy, leveraging $1 dollar of rate payer funds it receives to attract more than $6 dollars of private investment. This investment has helped create thousands of jobs in our communities. This investment has reduced the energy burden on over 35,000 families and businesses, including low-to-moderate income in minority communities. This investment has led to the deployment of more than 325 megawatts of in-state renewable energy that will reduce the emissions that cause climate change and local air pollution that causes public health problems.
Green Banks across this country learn from Connecticut’s Green Bank, that the model of using limited public funds to attract and mobilize multiples of private investment can be applied beyond energy, to environment, transportation and other important areas of sustainability. The New York Green Bank, the New Jersey Energy Resilience Bank, Rhode Island Infrastructure Bank, Montgomery County Green Bank, the DC Green Finance Authority. Connecticut’s Green Bank has become the model that cities, counties, states across our nation and countries around the world are studying and adopting. H.B. No 6646 would create a new quasi-public called the Connecticut Earth Bank. S.B. No. 927 on the other hand would achieve substantially the same goals as H.B. No. 6646 without creating and new quasi-public but by simply broadening the Green Bank scope beyond clean energy to include environmental infrastructure.

Not only would S.B. No. 927 be a more operationally efficient approach using our existing Green Bank platform, but also there would be no increase in surcharges on electric rate payers as the Connecticut Green Bank would use its bonding authority to support environmental infrastructure investments.

S.B. No. 927 also addresses the important concerns raised by DEEP, DPH, and the Office of the Treasurer to protect the State revolving fund. The Green bank looks forward to working with the Committee to develop a policy that will attract more private investment in our state that will create jobs in our communities, help our growing businesses thrive, and improve the lives of our families through the green
economy. But doing so in an efficient way through an existing quasi-public, that leverage is the success of the Connecticut Green Bank. I’d be happy to take any questions that you might have.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Bryan. Do any Committee members have any questions? So I do have a question. Just for clarification, S.B. 927 is in which Committee now?

BRYAN GARCIA: It’s in the Banking Committee. The last week came out of committee as a joint favorable Bill, unanimously supported.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay. And, and, you favor that over this Bill because it works within the existing structure?

BRYAN GARCIA: That’s correct.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): I see, okay. Do you see any great harm to this particular Bill? Or just a larger cost perhaps, or?

BRYAN GARCIA: So there’re a couple things. One is the creation of a new quasi-public. The second is the inclusion of an additional rate payer surcharge to capital -- to capitalize the environmental infrastructure fund. We don’t believe that’s necessary. The Green Bank has the ability to issue bonds so we can support it through that funding mechanism. There’s also some language in there that really needs to be addressed with DEEP, the Office of the Treasury and the Department of Public Health around the State Revolving Fund.

So one of the challenges that we worked through in S.B. No. 927 was explicitly exempting the Clean Water Fund from this, uh, uh, agency or this statute
because they’ve been doing this for nearly 40 years. They’ve been issuing Triple A rated bonds to support the Clean Water Fund, the Drinking Water Fund which has helped addressed wastewater treatment plants, public drinking systems, so, working through the Banking Committee, we are explicitly exempting the State Revolving Fund from it, so that’s one thing that you’ll want to take a look at and work with the agencies to develop that.

Lastly, the creation of the Connecticut Earth Loan Guarantee Fund is a great concept. When we think about the infrastructure, the potential for an infrastructure fund in trying to bring in bond capital, low cost long-term capital, you can actually use the Earth Loan Guarantee Fund as a credit enhancement to attract more private investment to improve the environmental infrastructure, so we like that. If there’s an opportunity for this Committee to work with the Banking Committee, perhaps we can create that Earth Loan Guarantee Fund.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Representative Reyes please.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Garcia, thank you very much for your testimony here in front of the Environmental Committee today. And my -- I have a couple questions. The first one, have -- will there be an exceptions made with the tax with respect to the low-income housing -- low-income households?

BRYAN GARCIA: So let me just speak to the funding mechanism in this Bill as proposed, No. 6646. So it proposes to add a $1 mill surcharge on electric rate payers to support the implementation of the
Environmental Infrastructure Fund. That $1 million surcharge as we know in Connecticut would raise about $27 million dollars a year. So our belief, as the Green Bank, is that we should be focusing Electric Rate Payer Funds on things that are related to electric energy as opposed to using it for another source. Now having said that, with regards to the programs that the Connecticut Green Bank implements, we very much take our responsibility to serve low-to-moderate income communities as well as minority communities. As an example, many of you are seeing a number of solar PV going on the rooftops throughout our neighborhood.

In 2014, working with the economic resource center at the University of Connecticut, it was clear that we were failing to reach low-to-moderate income households. We took it upon ourselves, you know, we had a big discussion and a debate amongst our board. We were seeing a lot of private investment coming into the state, but it was unacceptable that we were leaving low-to-moderate income communities behind as the green energy economy grew. So we undertook a number of different initiatives. We increased incentives in this community. We provided data to the market that there is no correlation between income and FICO scores, so we want people to see low-to-moderate income communities are a place to make investment.

And the third thing was, we issued an RFP to find specifically a contractor in this space that would serve low-to-moderate income communities and we found a company out of New Orleans, Louisiana, they came up to Bridgeport, established a headquarters in Bridgeport. They now have 75 employees, 50 of them in Bridgeport, 25 of them here in Hartford, and
they’ve been specifically targeting LMI communities and minority communities. And I’m happy to now report that in Connecticut, we’re one of a few states in this country that now has proportionately the same amount of low-to-moderate income families that are demanding solar PV than non-LMI families. So, it takes a considerable effort to bring private investment in, but we felt that it was our role as a Green Bank to ensure that this growing green energy economy was inclusive of everybody in our community.

REP. REYES (75TH): All that’s, thank you, Mr. Garcia, that’s excellent. And through the chair real quick, you have -- you threw out some numbers. So the average household would pay how much?

BRYAN GARCIA: The average household for this Clean Energy Mill Fund would pay about $10 dollars per year that in aggregate comes to $27 million dollars per year. That’s in our written testimony so there’s that number there.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Mr. Garcia. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any? Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for testifying today. Welcome to the Green Bank. I just, I’m not a banker so I’m -- and I’m not sure how this process goes, but what -- under the definition of clean energy, say -- say some form of energy production with not really determined to be clean to the environment, would you -- you’re able to refuse to work with this entity or?
BRYAN GARCIA: That’s correct. We have an explicit definition that says our purpose is to focus on clean energy and it’s explicitly defined in statute. It tends to keep us away from nuclear and fossil fuel, obviously focusing in on clean energy resources.

Now, having said that, Connecticut is the fuel cell state, so we’re very supportive of an industry that is growing and manufacturing highly reliable fuel cell systems here in Danbury and Torrington, Connecticut. So, there are some other technologies that use fossil fuels.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): I’m not trying to go too deep in details, but I guess I have to approach that subject if I really want to clarify my question. If, for example, offshore wind was considered to be destructive to the environment, and not really helpful with creating jobs would the Green Banks still get involved?

BRYAN GARCIA: I think definitionally, wind falls within our clean energy statute. We have not been involved in offshore wind. We have been involved in onshore wind here in Connecticut. The offshore wind market is so large that, um, the type of investors and the type of developers in that market, we don’t tend to partner with. So that market is happening outside of the involvement of the Green Bank.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay, thank you, thank you very. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Representative. I believe Senator Miner had a question.
SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. So, I’m trying to be sure I understand. Does the Bill propose an additional tax over and above the rate that’s already on people’s electric bill or does it stay within the confines of what’s already on.

BRYAN GARCIA: The Bill as we read it proposes an additional surcharge of $1 mil.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Senator. Yes, Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. Bryan, you said earlier that S.B. No. 927 would potentially expand Green Banks’ ability to get into the infrastructure/equipment, then that this Bill would try to create and go -- expand from your original mission statement. Correct?

BRYAN GARCIA: That’s correct.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Okay. I was kind of doing two things at once and I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

BRYAN GARCIA: Yes, plus, if I can just add, it does two things. One is it creates a definition of environmental infrastructure in our statute just like it does for clean energy, and then it creates an environmental infrastructure fund for the purpose of separating the clean energy funds that we receive through the system benefit charge from the funds that would go into the Environmental Infrastructure Fund. So, almost the opposite of what’s put into this Bill.
REP. GRESKO (121ST): So if this proposed piece of legislation that you’re testifying on is a -- gets its start-up money from, from rate payers via the increase on their bills, where does -- where does Green Bank currently get its funding from that is specifically targeted towards sustainable energy.

BRYAN GARCIA: Great, so just given the history of the System Benefit Funds, we, through Public Act 98-28, AN ACT CONCERNING ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING created 2 funds. One was the Conservation and Load Management Fund, which is administered by the utilities. Last year, Public Act 18-50 renamed that fund to the Conservation Adjustment Mechanism. That mechanism receives $6 mills, so take our numbers of $1 mill, multiple that times six. The utilities run incentive programs for energy efficiency so I’m sure everyone on this Committee who has done home energy solutions understands their home energy consumption. The utilities administer those programs.

And the second fund that Public Act 98 created with the Clean Energy Fund, a $1 mill surcharge. That fund has been collected since the early 2000’s. Our predecessor to the Green Bank, the Clean Energy Fund utilized those funds as grants as well as venture capital to invest in new technologies.

When the Green Bank was created in 2011, the goal was to shift the market reliance away from grants and attract more private investment in the State economy and because of that, we’re getting higher leverage, more investment in Connecticut, more deployment of clean energy. So it’s been a shift in the model.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Mr.
Garcia. Okay next is Jim Giovani from the Town of Windsor. Welcome. Thank you for your patience.

JIM GIOVANI: Thank you, Madam Chair for the opportunity to speak in favor of H.B. No 6429. I sit in front of you as a councilman for the Town of Windsor, and the 4th term President of the Connecticut Tree Warden’s Association, and a member of the State Vegetative Management Taskforce. I’m going to summarize my presentation. I will give you more information on the tree awards and our roles and what we do. As a -- as a councilman, and we’re in our budget process right now, and our town tax is about 16 percent from non-tax sources for our taxes. You know, we’re still in question about the education of car-sharing, payment rule of taxes, teacher’s pension, these are things that we have in mind when we propose our budget. When we -- having this information helps us pass our budget, pass referendums which are very expensive when we don’t.

So this House Bill that would be a funding source is a Bill that would help a lot of towns in the State of Connecticut, the Towns of Windsor, a lot of the smaller towns that are stressed with revenues who manage our -- manage our forests.

In 2011, the State Vege -- the State Vegetation Management Taskforce, we were formed from recommendation 23 of the Two Storm Panel that Governor Malloy had, and one of our recommendations back then was that each town be funded $2 thousand, $200 thousand dollars 2 years in a row to manage our forests. That funding did not come through, but I think it gives an example of what we were experiencing back then at that time.
Most folks probably know the State of Connecticut has a statute that says that all towns must appoint Tree Wardens, qualified Tree Wardens. Now that Tree Warden can additionally appointment a Deputy Tree Warden. Their role is to minimize liability and maximize urban canopy. When I say minimize liability, we do surveys of our urban forests of all our state -- our trees and what not to make sure that there’s safe passage. If, you know, a tree has a target which are human beings, domestic animals, transportation systems or personal property, then we have those trees removed.

It was a few years back -- the consequences can be devastating -- a few years back a tree came out on the Mirror Parkway and stuck a family in their car, where two adult lives were lost and two kids were left. I believe the State settled for $5.5 million dollars out of court for the settlement on that. So we have a very strong concern about the condition of our forests right now and the trees that we have and how we’re going to manage them. As far as maximizing our urban canopy, we’re not even looking at that right now, because we have to manage what we have going on out -- all the hazards. In an urban environment, there’s no natural forest succession. You have to plant the trees that are removed, and we have a big program now where we’re going to be starting the Right Tree Right Place, so the trees that are planted won’t incur expenses in the future such as the trees that are on our utility distribution systems and UPC, that affect the power that comes through our towns.

We -- the Tree Wardens, are a nonprofit organization. We education Tree Wardens about their roles and responsibilities for the proper care of
trees. We conduct educational programs that help them maintain their credit step they have. We have Lunch and Learns, we have workshops, advanced tree water training, municipal tree care industry where we’ll go to towns and teach those towns how to educate their forces. And we have a Tree Warden school. When I say a qualified Tree Warden, just a few years back that we had legislation pass, a statute in Connecticut that says all Tree Wardens will -- has to be qualified. Prior to that, anybody could be a Tree Warden, you just had to be appointed. And they didn’t have the professional level to make our forests safe, so we’ve got this regulation, this statute that you passed, where everybody has to maintain that -- that certification.

Going back to, you know, 2011 when we had the snowtober Storm, October nor’easter and then we had the storm down by the course -- uh coast, we had Storm Sandy that followed, our state really got hit pretty hard and we had a hard time recuperating from that, managing our forests and now we’re adding to that as we’ve all seen in all areas in the State of Connecticut, climatic change. Here where we talk about the insects, funding to manage the insects. Tornados were seen, droughts and maturing forests.

As you know, in the State of Connecticut, we have lands that are being shut down already. Some of our State parks are being shut down because we don’t have the funding to manage those parks.

So this is an asset to the towns if this proposed Bill should pass to give us some money to provide for our towns. I know that in a smaller towns that don’t have tree crews, and they might have a 4-
person group, and they don’t have any equipment at all. They don’t have the funding to purchase the equipment. They don’t have the funding to train them. And more so than that, it’s going to be very difficult to find companies that -- qualified companies that are going to come and manage their forests for them and very costly to come in and make their roads safe. You can’t have folks on public properties and streets and right of ways where there’s hazardous trees, they have to be removed, but you have to stop the traffic, so. They’re in dire needs of this money.

So I’m here to, you know, support this Bill and I would like to mention that right outside our door, in 1854 Bushnell Park was the first public funded park in the State -- in the United States, the first publically funded park in the United States. They went to the city council, they made a proposal that the voters approved it and they started that. And now we have an opportunity to have some public funding to manage our forests in Connecticut. I am open for questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thanks so much Mr. Giovani. I appreciate your testimony and certainly can appreciate the issues that these insects have created for many municipalities. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Madam Chairman. Just scurrying around trying to find the statute book, and maybe you know already, do we allow municipalities to use either LoCIP Funds or Town Aid for Road Funds for the purposes of tree removal?
JIM GIOVANI: I believe that Bill just passed or it’s moving through the -- moving through the legislature now. Yes, the LoCIP money.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Oh, yeah, could you hit your microphone Mr. Giovani? It’s, yep the little button there. Thank you. Is the button not, if you just press the button there.

JIM GIOVANI: There we go, okay. Thank you.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): The answer to my question was, as I understand it, that there is a Bill currently before the legislature that may have passed out of a Committee?

JIM GIOVANI: Yes, for LoCIP Revenues that towns can use for tree management.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): And what Town Aid for Roads, do you know whether those funds can be used for tree?

JIM GIOVANI: I’m not too sure on those rules, but I do know, you know, speaking from a town, in my town, we spend a million dollars a year just to overlay our roads once every 25 years and that’s just -- that’s just mill and pave, that’s not reconstruction, which a lot of them need. So, we couldn’t -- we can take money out of there as an emergency, but we’re going to lose our roads.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you. So I want to be clear. I’m not advocating that we don’t do the Bill, I’m imagining that we get one opportunity this year in the legislative cycle to do as much as we can and if we’re able to keep this legislation moving along and at the same time, can remove any other impediment that would not allow elected
officials or appointed officials, or public works personnel that are trying to be mindful of the hazards along roadways, I want to make sure, that, you know, when we gavel out at the end, in the beginning of June, hopefully, we’ve given you ever tool that we can possibly give you including being able to better use the funds that you already have. And I think impediments that would keep you from making those decisions, probably wouldn’t be good to have in place given the concerns that you’ve raised and others about damage done by the emerald ash borer, and then I think whatever the worm was that was kind of east of the river.

JIM GIOVANI: The gypsy moss.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Yeah, the, it just killed a whole bunch of trees as well. So that’s -- that was the reason for my question. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Senator. Any other questions? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming in. I’m sorry, I didn’t catch what town you’re from?

JIM GIOVANI: Windsor, Connecticut.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So what is the infestation that’s hitting your town the hardest? Is it the emerald ash borer?

JIM GIOVANI: We are getting the emerald ash borer, it’s a -- it’s a tough insect. On a Bell Curve, they’re going to sit around for three, four or five years in your town and you’re not going to notice them, but on the sixth or seventh year, within one year, it’s dramatic. They just -- they just get
into your forests. We have two river walks. One river walk we’re doing 90 -- a 90-tree removal right now, and that’s -- that’s just the tree that are hitting the target, we’re not taking them all out, we’re just hitting trees that will hit a target.

We have another river walk where we only have four, so it’s pocketed. In Windsor we have the gypsy moss, it’s going to be expensive, we just can’t lay the trees down on the ground. We cut them up and the river floods up and they become a navigational hazard down river. And they’re very expensive to remove once their dead. When a tree like that is dead, the labor costs goes through the ceiling. Normally we can lay a tree on the ground and feed the whole tree into a chipper. When an ash tree goes it dissolves on the ground, and when it does, the labor costs triple because it’s all about man hours. You can’t pick it up, you’ve got to rake it up, you’ve got to dump it in the back of your truck. You can’t put it through the chipper, you’ve got biomass issues and how to get rid of your biomass.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Um, do you -- have you done a survey of your area to find out how many trees are affected -- would need to be removed?

JIM GIOVANI: Yes, we do every year. Typically a Tree Warden -- that’s what we call windshield survey. We go through our whole town, we go through our open space areas, our right of ways, our easements, public properties, roads, pass-ways to schools. On the removals, we have about 150 on the street trees.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): 150 trees?
JIM GIOVANI: Yeah, yeah, within our tow -- in our streets and our parks, yeah. Yeah, there’s that many. At first I didn’t think there was that many until I decided to take an inventory.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Do you know if any of those are causing a dangerous situation on a road or a place where people walk, or are they basically in the woods.

JIM GIOVANI: All trees that were taken down now are just trees that are a hazard to people. We call it having a target. So it’s going to be people, personal property, transportation system or domestic animals. They all have them. The one thing we are doing is that we know they are going to die, so we’re trying to take the lives out as fast as we can. It’s a lot less expensive to get them out now.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Um, would it surprise you to hear that there are towns in Eastern Connecticut that have thousands of dead of Oak trees from the gypsy moss.

JIM GIOVANI: Oh no, sir, no. And you see panic -- I know that you’re from Lebanon and you represent Lebanon, Connecticut and that town is -- has a big emerald ash borer problem. I believe they’ve -- the town’s funded some of their revenues already, like $10,000 a year just to stay in advance and remove the live trees.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Well, most of the towns that I know of are scrambling to try to get some of the dead ones down that are cau -- that are on town roads that are a specific hazard, and at least one of my towns, Canterbury, I understand they counted over a 1000 trees, just hazardous trees on town
roads that were already dead. So, you know, certainly your -- the problem is statewide. If there -- you know, may be a different bug doing it, but it’s certainly a problem in a lot of places.

JIM GIOVANI: You’re correct, there’s no park -- there’s no park -- representing the Tree Warden’s Association, I deal with a host. And there are other tree removal issues, like mature forests up in at our Bradley International Airport which borders Windsor, 25 acres of trees had to be removed because they were too tall and the pilots were complaining about being too close to the trees; they were going to abandon that runway unless they were taking them down. So we had that situation there, then we have the ash trees at the river walk. We don’t have the gypsy moth problems, but within the state, you’re correct, different towns are experiencing different issues with trees; towns that have been struck by tornadoes, towns that have drought issues, so it is statewide, and that’s why this funding would be very helpful to the communities.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Okay seeing none, thank you so much Mr. Giovani. Okay is Representative Orange here? No. Representative Steinberg is not here. Senator Hartley is not here. We will get them up as soon as they -- I don’t see any of the legislators [laughing] and that who is left on the list. Are there any Representatives here that are not on the Committee? Okay. Seeing none, we will move on. You lucked out Mr. Sutherland. Are you here? I did see you. Okay.
[laughing] You are up next. So this is item number 1 on the agenda which is S.B. No. 1062, AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPAL CLIMATE CHANGE AND COASTAL RESILIENCY RESERVE FUNDS. Welcome, Mr. Sutherland.

DAVID SUTHERLAND: Thank you very much. I’m David Sutherland. I’m here today on behalf on the Nature Conservancy and I submitted testimony on five different Bills, both the Bills involving the Community Investment Act, but I want to particularly express my support for two Bills having to do with two different aspects of climate change and to thank the Committee so much for the attention your according to climate change this year. This Bill No. 1062 would provide municipalities as we heard from the folks from Branford with another important tool for trying to address and get ahead of some of these issues around the devastating impacts that we’re already seeing and that could get, probably will get far worst from climate change, specifically sea level rise, coastal storms, and river flooding. And I’ve put some kind of statistics in my testimony, but basically, a 1938 style hurricane, and I don’t think there’s anyone in the room here who was around for the 1938 hurricane, I might come closest, but I wasn’t even around for that. But I don’t think we can imagine how devastating that was and that type of hurricane hitting us now would be launched from a foot higher platform in the water because of sea level rise, and it would be attacking vastly more infrastructure along our coastline than the 1938 hurricane did. So these kind of tools are critically important.

And we also desperately need to go after the emission reduction side of climate change, and that’s where Bill No. 1064 is a -- would be a
critical tool to establish some sort of -- with some other states in the region carbon pricing. Many economists, and there are conservative think tanks. There are many Fortune 500 Companies that feel that carbon pricing, some form of it, would be the most effective way of dramatically bringing down greenhouse gas reductions. Yes, we agree that this would be better if the Congress adopted it for the entire nation, but there have been many times in our past when states have had to take the lead when Congress refuses to address a critical issue.

Wyoming and Kentucky led the way on women’s suffrage. Connecticut back in 1813 passed the first laws in the country having to do with child labor. And eventually Congress came around and passed child labor laws. Eventually, we know, we got women’s suffrage, but it was states that had to take the lead, and I think it’s critical now that states take the lead on bringing down our carbon emissions. It’s a critical, critical issue, so thank you very much for your attention to these issues.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Sutherland for your testimony. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you so much.

DAVID SUTHERLAND: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. All right, we are going to move on to, because Mr. Giovani already spoke on item number two, so item number three on the agenda is H.B. No. 5312, AN ACT CONCERNING VEGETATION MANAGEMENT WITHIN UTILITY PROTECTION ZONES. First up on that list is Alan Carey, Eversource. Welcome.
ALAN CAREY: Thank you for listening to my testimony today. We have submitted written testimony also. I am here from the Eversource Energy, I am the Manager of Vegetation Management for Connecticut, the distribution system. I am speaking today in opposition of H.B. No. 5312, AN ACT CONCERNING VEGETATION MANAGEMENT WITHIN UTILITY PROTECTION ZONES. H.B. No. 5312 First, H.B. 5312 proposes to amend THE General Statute 16-234, which governs the process by which utilities trim and prune trees along the roadside. This Committee is also aware, that the legislation has made comprehensive changes to that statute in 2013 and 2014 in order, among other things, provide additional notice, rights, and protections to customers, landowners affected by the tree trimming. It is heavily regulated activity that we perform.

Secondly, PURA continues to closely regulate and monitor the tree trimming activities numerous reports that are due as well as filings. PURA Reviews appeals from abutting land owners and those that disagree have the right to have hearings and decision either made by PURA or the Department of Transportation.

The Bill that is before us states that notice of tree work must be provided to the Tree Warden or town no later than two weeks prior to the proposed date of such tree work. Utilities are all currently required under 16-234 to make notice to the Tree Warden, as well as get permits to the Tree Warden. We have a number of arborists that are licensed by the State of Connecticut that work for Eversource that work very, very closely with the Tree Wardens and Deputy Tree Wardens within the towns, keeping them abreast of any issues that may come up and
dealing with any -- any modifications that customers may like to see made or any revisions. We have a very strong relationship with Tree Wardens in Connecticut and there is no need to try and require some additional notification, we are already providing that.

The Bill also provides for a survey -- a satisfaction survey that, per the Bill, is to be torn off and given to the customer as such that they can fill it out and return it to PURA. The questions that kind of come out of that, is what type of satisfaction might they be looking for? We practice arbor culture standards set up by the national agencies. We have our standards in terms of trimming trees or removing trees near power lines such that the clearances are already established by PURA, and when we have an unsatisfied customer related to tree trimming, we typically get information right away. They call us, email us, and we respond to that in an appropriate fashion.

UCONN did a survey of customers that had just recently undergone tree trimming, and one of their key findings was that attitude scales suggest favorable perception of the accountability of those who do vegetation management, that vegetation management contributes to greater public safety and minimizes power outages that vegetation management for reliable power is of greater importance than protecting trees. So we do have some feedback mechanisms from our customers regarding the jobs we do and the importance that they place on it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Mr. Carey, if I could just ask you to summarize, the time is -- the three minute limit for members of the public, but I
apologize that the timer is not going off, so if you could just summarize for us, that would be terrific and then we will ask the Committee if they have any questions for you.

ALAN CAREY: In summary, the Bill that is in front of us, puts a number of onerous requirements in terms of reporting on us as well as administrative burdens getting back to the customer when the tree work is completed, and we think that the language that is included in the Bill is completely unnecessary.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. If I might just ask you a couple of questions. You mentioned that notice is provided to the Tree Warden. How much notice is typically given and what is required now if any -- if there is any requirement?

ALAN CAREY: So by January, the end of January every year, we provide maps as well as proposed starting days for tree works in their towns and the numbers of miles that we will be trimming. So this goes out in a certified letter and package, return receipt required notifying the Tree Warden of our intended actions within the town. Additionally, as a followup, we have our arborists meet with the Tree Wardens prior to the work starting, setting up -- setting up the plans and starting to get those communication lines open.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So if there nothing that might come up after that report’s already been submitted to the town?

ALAN CAREY: Well, before we get into town, there is a permit required from the Tree Warden, so perhaps there’s two forms of notification. One, the one
before January 31 to the town Tree Warden, miles, projected starting dates. The arborist gets into town, a permit is required and at that time, they typically go through the scope of the work again.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And, um, a followup question on the satisfaction survey. Do you see, um, any possibility of working together with PURA to come up with a mutually agreeable type of satisfaction survey that you could get behind?

ALAN CAREY: Oh, it’s quite possible. But, I guess I would first question, what is it that we’re gauging the satisfaction of? Is it the quality of the arboriculture work? Is it the -- did we achieve what we tried to do in terms of trimming trees the correct distance away from the power lines? Did we mitigate the hazards of trees from the power lines? Did we do a good clean up? Most of those things, customers are not particularly aware of, if it’s good arboriculture or trimmed to the correct rec specifications. They could comment on the cleanup, but certainly we get those calls when the cleanup is not to their standard.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And I know that the Bill addresses this to a certain extent, but what extent do officials from Eversource or PURA at this point, involve the abutting property owners?

ALAN CAREY: To a large degree. So, we have trees that are in the right of way of the towns, we also have -- and we get -- we notify the abutting property owner of the intended tree work. If the tree is rooted on the abutting property owners land, we get their consent to do the tree work, so they are engaged. With the exception of trees that are in contact with or burning on the conductors, we are
in engaging customers with every -- with our tree trimming activities.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Carey. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for coming today. I -- as I look at this, it, it appears to me, um, you know, that, that it perhaps came out of a constituent that was not happy with perhaps response time or something like that. Or, or lack of understanding about what laws you follow in notification and so forth with abutting property owners. And I guess I can understand it. I also -- it also in my mind raises the question is, could it have anything to do with the major power line restorations that you’ve doing all over the place. I know in my district, I had someone contact me that was really upset and I wanted to let you know, that I was very impressed with the response rate that you gave to me and ultimately to the constituent. So, I think for perhaps every sad story, there may be is a glad story, and thank you for coming today.

ALAN CAREY: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Carey for your testimony. I understand that Representative Hughes has joined us.

REP. HUGHES (135TH): So excited, this is my first time testify in front of the Environment Committee.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Welcome. We’re glad to have you.
REP. HUGHES (135TH): Honored chairs, Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco, distinguished members of the Environment Committee. My name is Representative Anne Hughes from the District 135. I’ve had the distinct honor of representing a group from Weston, Ms. President USA today in, in um, in the Capital and they are incredibly concerned about the state of the environment, and they asked expressly for me to support, uh, H.B. No. 5384 and S.B. No. 229, which would eliminate the use of polystyrene containers and trays, and in support of H.B. No. 5385, AN ACT REQUIRING THE ELIMINATION OF SINGLE-USE PLASTIC STRAWS, with the provision that there be, uh, straws available for customers in restaurants that request them because they need them for, um, access to, um, food for, you know, for their -- if that is a need.

Um, they’re very, very concerned, these young women about the plastic bag, um, uh.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Representative, if I may. With all due respect, um, I’m so appreciative of their support, but those are -- that was our agenda from our meeting, and so if you could stick -- have your testimony stick to the issues on our agenda today. Did you want to testify on offshore drilling? [laughing] [crosstalk].

REP. HUGHES (135TH): I’d love to testify on that. Prohibiting offshore drilling for oil and gas, No. 588.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes, that’s on the agenda today.

REP. HUGHES (135TH): Yes, especially because, um, not only is it critical to preserving the marine life and it can definitely harm marine life. But I
really, really want Connecticut to be a leader in transitioning to renewable energy. And renewable energy is not offshore gas and drilling and oil. And, up, I was at the BOEM hearings last year where the -- they have to have these hearings in order to, um, lease -- the Federal Government to grant these leases and it was just crowded with people saying, don’t do it, don’t do it, because this is not the way we want to go. And Connecticut can be a leader in trans -- transitioning to a green economy and we really want to put in place the ban of seismic offshore drilling, not just to be a leader in the green economy, but a leader in a sustainable way of developing that transition that doesn’t harm marine and animal life. That, a lot of our -- even our fishing industry is really dependent on. So we have very, very critically endangered white whales in our offshore waters and we need to -- we have a responsibility as stewards to keep them. And, the young students were very concerned about those too. So, I’d like to offer my support on behalf of those. Is there -- I -- are we talking about the brown bear, hunting?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): No. That was our meeting agenda. So this -- yep, uh, black bear [laughing]

REP. HUGHES (135TH): Black bear, brown bear -- I’ve gotten more comments about that from my constituents, but um. [laughing]

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Does anybody have any questions for the Representative with respect to her testimony on the S.B. No. 588? No, okay. Thank you so much, Representative. Okay, so, moving back to H.B. No.
5312, next up is Louis Burch. I don’t see him. So we will move on to David Goodson. Welcome.

DAVID GOODSON: Thank you. Good afternoon Senators, Representatives and members of the Environment Committee. My name is Dave Goodson, I’m the Manager of Vegetation Management at United Illuminating and I’m here to testify on H.B. No. 5312. We oppose the Bill and urge the Committee to not take any action on it. Tree Warden notification, as outlined in this legislation is not necessary because state law already requires a Tree Warden permit for this work. A second notification would be redundant and would add cost to all electric rate payers for what is already a costly process. The Bill’s requirement to notify an arborist would add another layer of complexity to the process and would usurp the Tree Wardens’ authority for the care and control of trees within the municipal right of way. The Tree Warden is the only publically appointed office with the statutory authority to grant or deny tree work permits. We believe strongly that the delegation of authority to another entity would undermine the important checks and balances that are critical to an effective vegetation management system, and the safe and reliable operation of our electric grid.

We at UI can attest to the added cost and confusion based on our own recent experiences with such a system where a Tree Warden and a consulting arborist share the duties of permitting where trees are pruned or removed within the utility protection zone. Thankfully, this experiment has only been tried in a single town. I am not in favor of a process that requires the utility to arbiter of differing opinions between the property owner, the Tree Warden and the private arborist. UI and its
contractors have always provided property owners the opportunity to be notified in advance of when the work will be performed. The option is incorporated into our tree work planning software.

UI’s process for communicating with our customers and Tree Wardens is well established by obtaining consent for all non-emergency, non-direct contract tree work. We go beyond the letter of the law which requires only that we notify abutting property owners. We get consent on every property. Copies of UI’s consent form, uh, this document here, hopefully has been provided, and brochure, will provide a level of detail so you can understand how the process works.

In my testimony there’s a graphic that shows the timeline for notification, Tree Warden appeals, appeals to PURA, um, it’s a very well-documented process. What’s not included in this in Section 16-234 is the section of the law, a different law, that requires a Tree Warden permit. So every job we do requires a permit.

In regards to a survey, I’m not sure what the survey would be intended to do. But I can tell you after my 40 years of experience in the business, you’re going to get differing opinions. It depends on how you ask the question. If you were to say, how do you like the looks of the tree work? That would depend on who’s viewing it and it would make a difference whether it was before, during or after a storm.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Mr. Goodson, if I could just ask you to summarize. That was the timer going off over there.
DAVID GOODSON: Okay, I’m there. So, I thank you and I’m open to any questions you would have.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for coming in. Why do you think this Bill is here?

DAVID GOODSON: I think there’s a grave misunderstanding of the existing laws. The, the, the process that we follow requires a permit from the Tree Warden. So asking us to notify the Tree Warden is redundant. We cannot do any tree work outside of emergencies or trees in direct contact without a permit from the Tree Warden.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So, who do you think is misinterpreting the law?

DAVID GOODSON: A small part of a single community.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So, you think it’s a small part of a small community is misinterpreting the law and asked their legislator to put up a Bill?

DAVID GOODSON: That’s my interpretation, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Um, have you talked to them?

DAVID GOODSON: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And clearly, you haven’t convinced them.

DAVID GOODSON: No. I, you know, as part of my job, I tell all our towns in the UI territory we will come to any meeting any time with advanced notice,
any time you want to talk about trees, we’ll be there. We have laid this process out time and time again. Um, and I can’t explain why some people don’t understand it. The law -- the law in this case is absolutely clear on what we can and can’t do. And a Tree Warden permit, outside of emergencies is part of the process.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So how would this Bill affect what is current law? Your interpretation of the current law?

DAVID GOODSON: Um, the added part of this, is adding another layer by delegating some of the Tree Warden’s responsibility, which is all captured in the statures in 23-65 to another entity, to a -- I’ll say a third-party to, um, provide some insight into what we do and what the Tree Warden permits. The one situation where we have it now, it is very confusing for the property owners.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. All right. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you for coming to testify. I may be one of those people that you reference as far as people who don’t understand. So perhaps you can help me to understand a little better. So, let’s just say there’s a disagreement between the property owner and, and the utility with regards to whether a tree should be pruned or taken down for various reasons. How does that dispute get adjudicated?

DAVID GOODSON: So, when we ask the abutting property owner for consent, they can say sure, go
ahead as planned, they can ask for a modification, but when we get that work, and we collect all of this consent in a mobile app, we provide that complete work scope to the Tree Warden, and we lay this out for the Tree Warden and say, here’s all of the work we have planned, we need a permit from you. If an abutting property owner objects or asks for a modification, we will ask the Tree Warden to make a ruling on that objection or modification. That’s part of the process. The Tree Warden can say we agree with the property owner, or we agree with the UI, or they can say something -- I don’t agree with either of you, this is what I would do. At that point, either the property owner or the UI has the opportunity if we don’t agree with the Tree Warden, to take it to PURA for mediation. We’ve been doing this now for five years. We have never taken a mediation or objection to PURA. We’ve had several customers that have. In the past month and a half, in this town, where we have this experiment, three abutting property owners have gone to PURA asking for PURA to overrule what the town arborist has said we cannot do.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay. So it’s ultimately been -- I mean, what I’m gathering from, from what you’re saying is, ultimately it’s the Tree Warden, but if, if, if that gets disputed or gets challenged, then it goes to PURA.

DAVID GOODSON: Yes.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay. All right, thank you.

DAVID GOODSON: Sure.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Just one moment, I think they have a couple more questions. Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH): You’re not off the hook yet. [laughing] Thank you for being here. Can you just help me understand when you, um -- when there’s work that needs to be done on a private property, how does the homeowner know specifically what’s going to be done? Can they walk with one your representatives, do you tie things around certain trees, is there a map provided? So if you needed to appeal, how does the homeowner know what is going to be done exactly?

DAVID GOODSON: So in the package, um, they’ll see if -- we always try to meet face-to-face. If somebody is not there, this is what we call a door hanger, we hang it on the door knob. It’s got a brochure in it, what the important document you are referencing is our consent form. So before we do any work, we want the property owner’s signature to acknowledge that they understand what our proposal is. So the work planner will fill out this form, they’ll leave their phone number. It’s got the UI internet address as well as an email address on there. All of those emails go to me. And if somebody says, well, I don’t understand, either one of our contractors who plans this work, or one of our arborists will explain to them. We do not do this work, with the exception in emergencies and direct contacts, without a signed consent form and without a Tree Warden permit.

REP. PALM (36TH): So I’m not trying to be difficult, but I’m just wondering, supposing you
have a quarter mile footage, and there are 60 trees on it?

DAVID GOODSON: Yep. We will walk and talk and point out every single.

REP. PALM (36TH): Walk and talk, that’s what I wanted to hear. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? Comments? Thank you so much for your testimony sir. Okay, I see Senator Hartley has joined us. Welcome.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Good afternoon, Madam Chair, and Mr. Co-Chair, thank you so much for this opportunity on a very busy day here at the Environment Committee. For the record, I’m Joan Hartley, the Senator from the 15th District. I represent Waterbury, Middlebury, and Naugatuck and I am here in support of H.B. No. 5395, AN ACT REQUIRING AN EVALUATION OF THE STATE’S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE LAW. The environment -- Connecticut’s environmental justice law was enacted in 2008, and specifically it called for increased public participation in decisions to site expanded facilities, power plants, waste treatment facilities, disposable facilities and large air-emission producers in certain environmental justice communities. An environmental justice community is defined as a distressed municipality, or one that is in a census block where at least 30 percent of the population is below 200 percent of the poverty level. Simply put, the existing law allows for an increase in public participation, allowing for a public hearing essentially, where the community may put forward its position and then as the statutory language reads, the regulatory body may use that
information as influence in making their decision on the siting or the expansion. And then, the existing law further states that the municipality and the applicant may, its permissive, enter into a community benefit agreement for the purposes of mitigating the environmental and health impacts on said communities.

So the LCO before this Committee further defines, um, the specific environmental impacts. And so on line 47, you’ll see that it adds things such as air quality, water course, the quality of life, asthma rates, in addition to what was previously identified in the statute which was traffic, parking and noise.

Further, this LCO further requires that there will be a posting of notice. Previous, that was permissive as well; that they may post notice about, um, this hearing and this change.

And then it goes on, on -- I’m not sure what section this is, but lines 99 through 102, and it requires the applicant to start the process all over again in the event that the previous items were not complied with, the notice, and the opportunity to have a public hearing. So this change in the proposed legislation would require that a community that has five or more permitted facilities that they shall, not may, but that they shall enter into an environmental benefit agreement which is typically negotiated between the municipality and the developer, whoever is requesting to site either the new facility or the expansion of such facility.

So colleagues and chairs of the Environment Committee, and ranking members, what myself and my colleagues from the City of Waterbury respectfully request of the Committee is to consider adding a
quantifiable metric to the EJ, to the Environmental Justice statute in recognition of the fact that there is a point beyond which a community can no longer absorb an expansion or an additional permitted facility, and maintain a quality of life.

And I specifically speak here to an experience that we just had in the City of Waterbury. Um, it is a portion of my district, it is the entire district of the 75th House District, which is represented so capably by my colleague, Representative Reyes from the 75th, it’s densely populated area with essentially pre-World War II triple decker housing, along the Naugatuck River, it was decimated quite frankly during the flood of ’50. It is the poorest census track in the City of Waterbury. It is a minority community made up of predominantly Hispanic residents. It’s home to seven schools, numerous churches -- I lost count, maybe Representative Reyes could help me with that. It has the highest unemployment rate in the city of a rate of 25 percent. And just actually was the recipient of one of the Working Cities Challenge Grants based upon the goal of reducing, cutting in half, the unemployment rate from 25 percent, mind you, to 12 percent.

When in fact the State of Connecticut is now down in the 4 percent, 3 percent range. It has the highest asthma cases in the state, it’s actually 3.4 percent higher than the State average. And there was a stat that was shared with me and I’m not sure if it’s specific to the 75th District or the whole city, but we have this escalating number of visits to the school nurse for asthma case, there was 4000 that was reported. But I’m not sure if that was just the 75th District.
So, in this census track, there are at least 10 and, once again, Representative Reyes can correct me if I’m wrong, but there are 10 plus permitted facilities in this census track, recently the south end fought against yet another -- this time it was an expansion of such a facility. It was a transfer station which was seeking to expand to an MSW, a Municipal Waste facility, which would result in 80 trucks per day coming into that neighborhood 6 days a week. And of course, there was a public hearing, I should share with you. This evidence was presented and the permit was granted. And just recently, in fact, I think they’re probably starting the transition to the municipal solid waste shortly.

So, our question, colleagues, is how much is enough? And the community, you know, is like, when does this stop? What is the saturation point? And we did work under the guise of the Environmental Justice Law during this most recent application process. So, we’re asking that you consider adopting or incorporating in the Environmental Justice Statute, a metric which would simply say a certain number of permits, make it five, make it six permits in a particular area, use a census block, would then represent a saturation point; beyond which the community admittedly cannot absorb anymore. In, in order to maintain a decent quality of life.

And folks, I would just like, lastly to recognize the very skilled, patient, and helpful assistance from this Committee’s legislative LCO Office in sitting down, walking through this and trying to make a reasonable, um, proposal to you. But thank you very much and I certainly will entertain any questions.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Senator Hartley for that powerful testimony and for, uh, for working to further our enj -- our environmental justice laws. Certainly, incredibly important we know that, um, poor communities and communities of color are even more greatly impacted than those that aren’t.

Could you tell me, you know, there’s been some testimony about concerns around non-active community org -- you know, having a non-active community organization in the cities that are impacted by environmental justice law, and perhaps, because of that, making it very difficult to protest, um, or use their voice in a way, um, to allow citizens or residents of that community, um, to know of the dangers that might -- that they may be faced with should things be moving along and pollutants be a -- of utmost concern. So, I ask you, do you think, in your opinion, is there any way to sort of combat that and some of this legislation, I, I do believe gets at some of it. And also, do you feel the radius is sufficient when we’re talking about a one mile radius versus a three mile radius, or, um, in which this, um, polluting companies may uh take up a site. Do you think notifying citizens within a smaller radius is sufficient?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Well, thank you for your insightful questions. Let me start with the latter. With regard to the radius, you know, in my experience working and representing -- I’ve represented the 75th District now since I’ve been in the Senate. Previous to that I was just a neighbor to the 75th. But using census blocks really made a lot of sense, you know. You could talk about zip codes or this -- and I saw this in our application from the south end to the working city’s challenge.
And in fact, they were very careful about trying to identify what the specific area would be and so, you know, if you wanted to talk about a census block, that probably makes a lot more sense rather than, you know, a radius. And then once again with regard to lending a voice to these issues. So we have the EJ law on the books, but quite frankly, you know, this last experience I think really -- validated my opinion of it. It’s proforma. It’s going to give us a public hearing, okay, that’s nice you know. And everything else is permissive. You may then, you know, have a community benefit agreement, you know, the municipality and developer may decide to enter into this. And in that instance, the community isn’t even involved, it’s the municipality with the developer deciding whether or not they do this community benefit statement. So, um, I think it’s really important, you know -- we have all this conversation about health and health care, if in fact we do not want to escalate our need for health care in our incidences and our numbers, we can deal with this, you know, I think in a very factual manner. And what’s being ask is just to say establish a threshold, establish a number which says, beyond this, a community rationally, reasonably, environmentally cannot absorb anymore.

We were also very careful to recognize the incredible number of tasks that are on the agenda of the Department in view of, you know, uh lay of -- well not lay-offs, in vie -- retirements and so forth, the DEEP I know has had a number of vacancies. I see that when I see the budget and so rather than saying an air quality test, you know, that kind of monitoring and so forth, we’re talking about a simple number. And it’s very identifiable.
You can, I mean, we were able to go through it very, you know, cursory in our discussions to identify that. We have over 12 permitted facilities in this particular census tract. So that can easily done with no physical impact.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you very much, Senator. I believe Representative Reyes had a question.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Senator, thank you very much for testifying here today on this very important environmental justice law. I want to thank you and the citizens of Waterbury for their great leg work and Waterbury in this particular area has been -- just this particular distressed municipality has seen its share of battles with trying to force one more thing into that particular zip code, 06706, and 06708, and my question to you. I’m on record for, unfortunately, uh having said that the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection has completely failed the -- the stressed municipality. My question is, I think that a couple things were lacking here. Number one is that we don’t have an appeal process once a decision has been rendered, but where do you think -- where do you think that -- you talked about 12 and I’ve been highlighting, there’s well over 12 within a one mile radius, if I go out to two miles, there’s over 20. So my question to you, as what point do you think -- you said it very eloquently. We’ve reached the saturation point, and I would argue that we’re already there. So how do we help further municipalities, because this particular situation is beyond us right now.
What would we put in statute right now to make sure that what happened in Waterbury doesn’t happen in Hartford next, New Haven, Bridgeport, which is sure has its share of issues with environmental justice.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): So very simply put, and recognizing once again all of the requirements that we ask for is the Department of Environmental Protection to do, this -- establishing a number, a threshold. And so while we have and as I recounted, our most recent, you know, challenge, had not prevailed there, this would establish a high water mark which says beyond this number, there’s no ability for a community to absorb it, and to maintain a decent quality of life. I cannot imagine, Representative Reyes, that whatever number, hopefully the Committee could identify that this particular census block would be beneath it. So in that respect they indeed would fall under this umbrella as would any other similar city with similar circumstances.

REP. REYES (75TH): And, thank you, Madam Chair. If I could just ask one more question. The asthma -- the asthma rate statics absolutely floored me and this particular expansion isn’t going to help that situation. Yes, we do have six schools around the -- within a one mile radius of this particular expansion. My question then would be -- I know that the trucks that are go -- the additional trucks, which is between 75 to 100 per day coming up and down Exit 29 and tours the plant, um, these would be trucks that would be adding more pollution to that particular area. And for those of you that don’t recognize this particular area is in a valley, so that -- it’s in the south end of Waterbury and it’s
in the valley, so everything will go up and it goes up into the hills. I, I think that the number -- the 4000 number that you were looking at was strictly in that particular zip code, which is in the south end. So it’s a very drastic situation.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Thank you very much Representative for that clarification. I wasn’t sure.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Representative.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Any other questions or comments for Senator Hartley? Great, seeing none, thank you, Senator for your time.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH): Thank you so, so much, and I hope your day moves quickly.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Did Louis Burch come back into the room? I don’t believe so. So next member of the public, moving on, is Phil Neaton, on S.B. No. 76, AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPALITIES TO RESTRICT THE USE OF PESTICIDE IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE MUNICIPALITY OR CERTAIN TYPES OF PROPERTIES. Welcome.

PHIL NEATON: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon. Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco, and members of the Environment Committee, my name is Phil Neaton, I’m a golf course Superintendent of the Black Hole Golf Course in Old Lyme, Connecticut current President of the Connecticut Environmental Council. CTEC is a member organization representing six professional associations including Connecticut Grounds Keepers Association, the Connecticut Tree Protective Association, the Connecticut Pest Control
Association, the Connecticut Irrigation Contractors, the Association of Golf Course Superintendents, and Connecticut Tree Wardens Association. CTEC opposes S.B. No. 76 for reasons that include concerns with public health, regulatory inconsistencies, and the undue burden on our businesses.

A patchwork of regulation jeopardizes health and safety. The state must maintain control of pesticide usage for vector controls, pest management and keeping our public spaces healthy.

When pesticide regulations are left to local government there is no coordination among adjoining jurisdictions or coexisting jurisdictions such as city and regional government entities.

We do support H.B. No. 5999 to increase funding for DEEP Pesticide Division to approve their ability to collect data, process licenses, and of course current laws. They are, and should be the ones who monitor State pesticide policy.

We also support H.B. No. 6429 to help fund removal of dead trees that have been killed by gypsy moths, and emerald ash borers. This is going to be a real problem when these dead trees start falling. Thank you, and I’d be happy to answer questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Neaton for being under time. [laughing] Do any Committee members have questions or comments? Seeing none, thank you so much.

PHIL NEATON: Thank you for your time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Next, we are alternating because I see Representative Steinberg has arrived. Good afternoon Representative.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Good after, Madam Chair, Mr. Chair, and members of the Environment Committee. I’m here to testify in favor of S.B. No. 1064, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CARBON PRICE FOR FOSSIL FUELS SOLD IN CONNECTICUT. As many of you may know this is my third year bringing this Bill before you. I’m really hopeful that the third time is the charm in this case. There is a coalition now of northeastern states, but also states in the Pacific Northwest and now the Atlantic states called the Carbon Cost Coalition. A number of legislators here in Connecticut are members of that coalition and I’m one as well. Our goal is to come up with a plan that works for a number of states which have different needs and different issues, and that we would have sort of a mutual trigger such that only when we achieved a certain density of population in geography, that we would put something like this in place. And this is indeed the scheme of this that has been used out in Canada and California, and the Pacific Northwest to look at ways to make this feasible. We’re not arguing that Connecticut should go it alone, but there is legislation before legislators in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine.

I’m here today without a strong point of view about one of the more central issues, which is a revenue neutral versus a revenue positive approach. Just for clarification, revenue neutral would return virtually every dollar collected by the carbon charge to consumers and perhaps to employers. A carbon positive would dedicate some of those funds, some percentage to perhaps low income households which have more difficult making some of the adjustments for energy efficiency and for renewable
environment. And conceivably to companies to encourage them and to incentivize them to make investments such that they would also be able to achieve energy efficiencies.

The, the reason I’m open-minded about this is I think there’s an opportunity. We’re talking a lot these days about climate action and taking appropriate actions to reduce our carbon footprint, but I think the real issues are actually some -- related to that. One is that we have an opportunity to create good paying green jobs here in the State of Connecticut, new jobs as some of our old fossil fuel jobs become, uh, less attractive, this is an opportunity to evolve businesses that are in the energy business to the new landscape which is inevitable. I sincerely believe we will need fossil fuels indefinitely for certain purposes and we need to really dedicate those to those purposes. I think the home heating oil industry has done a nice job with biofuel trying to change their impact on the environment as well. But the shift to renewable energy and energy efficiency is inevitable. So, in our interest to help companies to create new green jobs in the state, and you know, whether you look at hydrogen fuel cells or some of the other things we’re doing, we’re actually making a lot of progress on that, so there’s a real jobs argument for something like this.

Lastly, as Co-Chair of the Public Health Committee, there’s a strong public health argument. The impact on asthma and cardiovascular disease -- disease is demonstrated. Representative Reyes was talking about asthma, the asthma rates in Connecticut are among the highest in the nation. We spend over $135 million dollars on asthma-related costs back in
2014, I imagine it’s much higher now. This has a huge impact on every taxpayer in the state as we’re trying to take care of people oftentimes who can’t afford their own insurance and are incurring huge health impacts. This is an opportunity for us to do something about it in the state, and we do see health impacts in the state, so I would argue this is a time to have the conversation about a carbon pricing program. As I said, I’m open-minded to how we might construct it, but I think the Committee should seriously consider this being the year to move such a Bill forward. I’m glad to answer questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative and I commend your efforts over the past year in trying to see this to fruition. I would ask -- I mean certainly we hear in opposition of the Bill and there has been testimony submitted to that effect, what would you say to those who, um, believe that funds set aside for this purpose would be rated?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Well certainly we have a credibility problem here in the State of Connecticut. [background laughing]. It was very unfortunate that we committed the original sin of raiding those funds and we do not have a good track record, even with the special transportation fund. I hesitate to recommend a lock box because we put a lock box in everything, but there’s nothing in the General Fund. But, for example, up until that point, we had been very good at taking the funds generated through Reggie and other things and really devoting them explicitly to purposes that -- for which they are intended. I think that if we are very serious about indicating the benefits and where these funds will be dedicated, it will be very hard
for us to divert them in that fashion, because people will be counting them, and I think particularly, if we’re going to be taking money out of the pockets of consumers for whom we promised that, we will face the ire of the electorate for doing so. So there are no guarantees. I wish I could say there are. But I don’t know if that’s an excuse for not making the kind of changes we need to make as a state and we -- we can find a way to have greater confidence those funds will be used for the purposes intended.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any, yes, Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. There’s the argument that we’re going in a positive direction now, a program like this would, would hinder the market. Let the market continue to do what it’s doing. There’s arguably, um, proof that we’re getting away from coal, for example, despite efforts to bolster it up. Um, and the market will solve this over time.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): You bring up a good point, Representative. I think to your point, hundreds of companies now, large and small are embracing some sort of carbon pricing into the way they do business. They’re seeing the benefit of it. It’s very clear and it’s the future, and it’s inevitable, they want to get behind it. The problem is there are sectors that are lagging in that regard. Certainly low income don’t have the wherewithal to make the investments, they’re lagging behind. Why should they be discriminated against in terms of their ability to see a reduction in carbon use, and
also energy efficiency and, and other benefits. They’re being left behind.

I’m also very concerned for certain aspects of our energy industry that are fossil-fuel based that are facing competition from renewables and many of them are relatively small, family-owned organizations, that might need the assistance to make the evolution to a more diversified energy portfolio than they may be able to provide. I want to offer them the opportunity to make some of those changes such that they are going to be able to continue to keep their employees employed, and maybe even pay them a bit more in the new green economy which is already emerging.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Yes, Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to ask you in -- in the section about neighboring states, after line 255, um, we say this goes into effect when Massachusetts and Rhode Island also pass their version in a certain rate per ton. And should we not include New York here, and have all of our surrounding states pass it at the same time?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): That’s a good question. You know, I think the more states we add the bigger hurdle it is. But there is an argument for, as I said, achieving that sort of critical mass in geography or population that would make it easier for that to go forward. At the time, this is kind of a bit of a repeat from last year, New York was lagging behind a little bit. To your point, I think they’ve made a lot of progress. I think that’s worth considering. I just want to stress, I and
others are open-minded to fashioning something that we really think is going to be practical and is not going to unfairly bind Connecticut in advance. So, if that’s something that you think would be helpful, I think that’s certainly worth consideration.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Well, I’ve been hearing a lot from the propane dealers [laughing] and they are concerned about the border issues, so I’m thinking that if we advance the Bill, we probably should have the -- all the states go together as partners on this so our whole region goes together.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): To your point, I think it’s very important for all the stakeholders who are concerned about geographic inequities, make sure they have input into the final shape of this Bill and I think that’s actually a good idea for us to get it to the point where we have a greater buy in across the industry.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you Representative for coming to testify and for your efforts over several years on this issue. I’m just curious to know, um, where the -- I believe it’s $15 dollars per ton was the price that was -- that’s in the Bill here? Let me take a look. Uh, $15 dollars per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent, um. And it -- any, um, um, -- I guess that would change over time, why is that the starting point I guess would be the question.
REP. STEINBERG (136TH): That’s a good question. I’m not sure there’s a magic number necessarily. There are those who think we should start at a much higher charge per ton to really stimulate the kind of changes that we’re talking about. It reflects conversations with legislators in other states trying to start a level which we would certainly begin to change behaviors but not be initially to onerous. And to your point, the idea would be to ratchet it up slowly over a period of years until we get to the point where we’re really discouraging use of fossil fuels over a long period of time. There’s an errantly arbitrariness about it, but that has been a scheme that has been used by, you know, in Canada in elsewhere as sort of a starting point. Again, I’m open-minded about where you want to start and how fast it goes. But there has to be enough sort of skin in the game to justify the effort.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): If I may, Madam Chair, just one other question. Um, and I should know the answer to this, but I do not, so I’m going to ask -- so other political entities, states, provinces, have experimented with this, and -- I presume, and I’m just wondering what, what the -- how’s it going so far, I guess would be my question.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Good question. Probably the most relevant situation is what the Canadian provinces and the Pacific Northwest including California have done, it’s not exactly the same as we’re recommending here, but they have I think only a couple of years at most experience. I don’t have the data before me, certainly they have not encountered problems. Their circumstances are perhaps different than ours and much larger geographies involved there too, they’d benefit from
having such a large geography all under the same basic program. But that’s the one which would probably be the one that we would refer to as having the most experience and I think it is worthy to note that they have been able to institute this without huge dislocations of their economy were really negative impacting people thus far.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you very much.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Any other questions or comments? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming in on -- and talking about this Bill. Um, I have a couple of questions from the standpoint of somebody who would have a house and a car, and just do your normal things that people do in this state, um, most of the people in my district using heating oil to heat their house. This says that it would be $15 dollars per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent. How many gallons of heating oil would that be?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): That’s a really good question and I’m surprised I don’t have the answer for that and it does also depend upon the composition of the heating oil I imagine as well. I do not know what the precise equivalency would be. I’d like -- I’ll try to find that out.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, I’d appreciate it, because it would certainly make a different if it was, you know, a few gallons or if it was thousands of gallons, you know, that would certainly make a difference. Do you have any idea --
REP. STEINBERG (136TH): It’s more than a few gallons, I can assure you of that.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Do you have any idea how much it is for gasoline?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Again, I don’t have that number for you but that’s something that I think we could probably find out.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. You indicated that it would increase slowly over time. Under the Bill it would increase the 15 -- the initial $15 dollars would increase by $5 dollars per year every year. Um, so in three years, it would double. That sounds like a lot of money. Um, where does this money go?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Well, as I stated earlier, there are two different approaches one can take. If you take a revenue neutral approach, all the revenue is generated minus some administrative costs would go back to consumers and employers depending on how we chose to break it. But basically everything would go back. Under the revenue positive program, we could devote a certain percentage, it could be 5, 10, 15, 20 percent to dedicate to specific areas of need. Explicitly perhaps helping companies make investments to lower their carbon footprint, and maybe to low income communities that are not in the same position to make those kinds of investments.

There have definitely been various versions out there. I don’t think there’s one perfect way to do it. I think given our recent experience in Connecticut, it might be better if we can, uh, try to promise people that we’ll return virtually all those funds to them by way of an annual dividend.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, do you know which one this Bill has in it?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Certainly regardless of what we have in the Bill, and it is a revenue positive at this point, it’s open for conversation. This Committee can make its -- have its own conversation about what the higher priorities are in this context. I think there is a legit argument for ret -- for devoting some of these funds for specific positive things that will impact, as I said, on creating jobs, reducing health impacts, things of that sort, but the Committee can decide if they so choose, to make this a revenue neutral version, which we’re -- we’ve come as close as we can to holding consumers harmless.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, let’s talk about the revenue neutral version. So, I buy heating oil to heat my house and the State takes a $15 dollar per ton charge on the heating oil that I buy. So, the -- so there’s presumably some administrative entity, some bureaucracy of some sort that’s going to charge this, take in the money, and then give it back to me?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): It will require some administration, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So, if they’re going to take the money from me, and then give it back to me, other than employing some State employees to move things around, what’s the point?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Well, I think that it is important that you see the point on this, sir. It -- the point is, by raising the price on things that involve fossil fuel production, our goal is to
discourage where we do see amount of that use of fossil fuels in favor of making the shift to less pollution intensive options. And the options that are becoming more and more available in terms of renewable energy or to encourage energy efficiency, would be the outcomes that we desire. So the idea is to change behaviors to that degree, as we often do with some aspects of charges or taxation.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, but under your revenue neutral option, it’s not really costing them anything because you’re giving me all the money back.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): That would be returned to you at the end of the year. In the meantime, you would be acquainted with the increased costs which the experience in other parts of the world that indicate do lead to changes in behavior.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Now with the revenue positive model, so the State would be taking in this money, and keeping some of it, and then only giving me back a portion of it, right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I wouldn’t put it quite in that fashion. It would be returning perhaps the vast majority of it, but devoting a percentage, 5, 10, 15, 20 percent to other priority needs such as low income communities which is not in the same position as many others to make certain investments, or to devote it directly to businesses to help them make that kind of conversion from their existing model to the model which is going to allow them to prosper in the future with higher paying jobs.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Is there anything that guarantees that it won’t just go into the General Fund?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): You know, I think we’ve all learned that guarantee is a strong word around here. As I said, the degree to which we promise to return to the consumers and fail to do so, we do, at our own risk as legislators. Uh, you know, I’d love the idea of a lock box, but I’m also reluctant to create lock boxes everywhere because that becomes problematic for funding things when we have shifts in revenue.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Um, in my district, the alternative generally to home heating oil, is wood. So when oil gets expensive, people burn more wood. Um, is that an outcome you’re looking forward to?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Not exactly, no. Thank you for, for making that distinction. Where burning has its own pollution related issues, um, it sounds like in some parts of the state, that should be transitional, will be a bit more challenging. It does remind of some of the conversations I’ve had with legislators from the State of Maine and other places where they face some of those same choices that you described, also have longer driving distances. So again, we may need to shape this so that we do not create regional inequities in that fashion, but also I would submit that there is a fairly rapidly changing landscape in favor of renewable energy alternatives that are accessible regardless of where you are in this state, and that also energy efficiency plays a large role and to be a part of the solution for those people in the areas you described.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Now this would also affect gasoline, right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Correct.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So right now, I believe our gas tax, the two of them combined is somewhere in the 42 cent range? Is that about right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): It’s among the higher in the nation, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, so if this Bill were to pass, what would be added to that tax?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Again, I would need to do the calculations. It would be certainly more than a few cents, so it would have a direct impact on people’s perception of the cost of gasoline with intent of changing the behaviors to a point to reduce driving that wouldn’t be deemed necessary.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So, if you -- you live out where I am and it takes a long time to drive to Hartford or many other places where people work, um, what’s the alternative? There’s no buses, there’s no trains. All this would do is increase the cost of getting people to work. What’s the alternative?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I think we’ve seen the alternative playing out before our eyes as we speak. The risk, certainly, of hybrid vehicles with much higher gas mileage in combination with electric. Our manifest -- you hear every major manufacturer of cars committing themselves to transitioning to electric vehicles in the next three to five years. You know, again, this may take us a while to get to, but I think most people believe that the internal
combustion engine is going to be in the minority in a period of years and that most people will embrace the shift to electric vehicles which do not involve gasoline.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. But this would also be charged on any fuel used to generate electricity, right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): They have the original greenhouse gas initiative, this is not about necessarily the electrical supply.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, so this -- so this fee would not be charged to the producers of electricity who are burning fossil fuels to generate electricity?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I think, first of all, you will find that in the State of Connecticut, we’re well along the path to no longer burning as much fossil fuels unless you want to describe natural gas as burning a fossil fuel. We’ve certainly -- just about at the end of our coal-fired plants and also shutting down many of our oil burning plants as well. So, again, we are, we are on an evolutionary path whereby the most polluting of fossil fuels are in decline.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, well, I’m reading this Bill lines 33 through 35, petroleum product means any petroleum derivative that is commonly burned to produce heat, electricity or motion. Sounds like natural gas fired energy plants are going to be taxed.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): So, and as I was saying, it’s on a relative scale. Natural gas would not be
liable for as much tax as certainly the other fossil fuel sources that we’ve typically used in the past for electrification.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, but it’s still going to increase the cost of electricity in this state, right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Considerably, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And when the -- it would also increase the cost of jet fuel, right?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Yes, and I would help that those who have jets would be changing their behaviors. But we are trying to get to get away from using jet fuel in virtually any circumstance. It is only generally used at peak time, and I think with the further evolution of renewable energy, energy storage, and energy efficiency, I would hope that time is not far off where we would not need to use jet fuel for anything other than flying jets.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, what’s the alternative for jet fuel to fly an airplane?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): That’s one of the uses where I believe that, that jet fuel is the most -- the fossil fuels are most appropriate, we’ve yet to come up with electric planes that can cover the distances that we’re looking for. So to your point, yeah, that would increase the costs of jet fuel for the purposes of flying jets.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, which would obviously increase the cost of jet travel.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I think we’re on the same page, Representative. The idea is by raising the
costs for various fossil fuel related items, we would be, in some cases, trying to stimulate changes in behavior such that we would use less fossil fuel and reserve it for the purposes in which it’s really requires and enable to shift to renewable energy and energy efficiency.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, but I guess I have to go back to my question. How -- in order to change behavior, there has to be an alternative. And for jet travel, I don’t know an alternative. I don’t think there are electric airplanes or anything that’s powered by anything other than some type of petroleum product. What behavior are we trying to change other than taking money from people?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I think you have found the perhaps the one exception when we’re talking about jet fuel, which I’m not sure is necessarily the item that most consumers are going to be worried about on a day-to-day basis. I don’t have an answer for you. There is not, to my mind at this point in time, a real alternative to jet fuel for flying jets. So, I will grant you that point, it’s well taken.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, how about boats? I don’t know of any, any boats any fishing vessels that are anything -- that burn anything other than type of petroleum product. Do you?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I do know a lot of boats seem to be able to power themselves through something called wind. And I also -- I have heard of a company called electric boat, I hope they get that -- get there some way sometime.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, um, I have not seen any, any major fishing vessels powered by -- powered
by electricity, perhaps you have, I’ll have to look into that. Um, they -- but, all right. Um, and this would be all fossil fuel that is sold in the state?

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): Yes, my understanding, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): All right, thank you very much, I appreciate your answers.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative Any other questions or comments for Representative Steinberg? Thank you Representative. Oh, almost, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you Representative Steinberg. Um, I just wanted to follow up on one of the questions from Representative Dubitsky. I’m looking in Google and finding all kinds of answers for the, uh, CO2, and the oil. So I will send it to both of you, I just wanted to point that out. Thank you.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH): I’m sorry, I didn’t have the opportunity to Google to Representative Dubitsky’s questions in real time, but thank you for that.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. And again, thank you Representative Steinberg for your testimony. I do see that Louis Burch has joined us, so I will go back and um, this is on H.B. No. 5312. Welcome.

LOUIS BURCH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Apologies for missing the call earlier this afternoon. Honorable Committee chairs and members, my name Louis Burch, Connecticut Program Director at Citizens Campaign for the Environment. Thank you for the opportunity
to testify today. I’m here to speak in support of four Bills starting with H.B. No. 5312, AN ACT CONCERNING VEGETATION MANAGEMENT. CCE certainly supports this legislation. It creates mechanisms to improve accountable for contracted arborists and increased transparency for municipalities and home owners as well as offering property owners an ave -- a better avenue to intervene in unwanted tree removals. Um, we think it’s a good Bill, it should -- it makes sense and it should pass.

S.B. No. 76, authorizing municipalities to restrict pesticides in certain areas; we’re in strong support of this legislation. Connecticut has acknowledged a number of times over the years the health and environmental impacts related to pesticides including restricting pesticide use on school grounds, public playing fields and restricting certain pesticides to help promote pollinator health. But the preemption law denies local governments their democratic right to protect the health and environment of their own communities by going farther than the current state law -- what the current state law prescribes and so we think it makes a lot of sense to lift that pesticide preemption law and return that right to municipalities as soon as possible.

H.B. No. 5999, AN ACT CONCERNING PEST -- REGULATION OF PESTICIDES IN Connecticut. Again, we’re in strong support of this legislation. DEEP, as you all know, has experienced significant budget cuts in recent years which have affected many of their programs including the pesticide program. CEQ released a report in 2017 saying that pesticide enforcement in Connecticut as it -- is at a 15 year low. Pesticides are toxic, they must be used with
H.B. No. 5999 would dedicate funds from pesticide product registration and applicator certification to support pesticide management program activities at DEEP, including inspections and enforcement. It’s a good Bill and it ought to pass.

We also support S.B. No. 588, concerning offshore drilling. CCE is opposed to the Department of Interiors and Bones Plans to expand offshore drilling in the outer continental shelf. We’ve seen lasting, devastating impacts of oil spills in the United States including the deep water horizon and the Exxon Valdez disaster. It is not a question of if these spills happen, but when, and such a disaster would clearly cripple Long Island Sounds’ economy and negatively impact water quality for decades.

I will conclude by saying that Citizen’s Campaign for the Environment is supportive of the concept behind H.B. No. 6647, AN ACT CONCERNING REGENERATIVE AGRICULTURE. However, we have some concerns about the existing language. We do support the language that has been proposed by CT NOFA, to change that to a Healthy Soils Program. Healthy soils required less pesticides and produce healthier food. And so -- and the language changes that have been proposed would actually make resources and information available to a broader range of the agricultural community and not just farmers that are engaged in organic agriculture. We think it makes a lot of sense and we’d the Committee to move forward with that substitute language.
So I will conclude my comments and thank you for the opportunity to testify.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Burch. Does the Committee have any comments or questions? Yeah, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for coming. I want to talk to you about the pesticide Bill, we’re having every town regulate pesticides differently. I represent some big open farming areas and many farmers have fields in multiple towns, or they have one field may span several different towns. If in one town a certain pesticide is required, it’s mandated, that is prohibited in another town, how is a farmer to carry out business?

LOUIS BURCH: That’s an interesting situation that you pose. Once again, we would encourage the farmer to look at, uh, less toxic means of production across the board. I think consistency is important. One of the things that we’re finding, particularly when it comes to pollinator health, that certain pesticides, particularly neonicotinoids that are being used in the agricultural setting, create all different kinds of problems because of the fact that bees and other pollinators travel long distances. And so this is one of the reasons that, you know, again, Connecticut as you know, you know, you weren’t here in the legislator when we passed the pollinator health law, one of the things that was contained in that was language encouraging community members to establish pollinator friendly habitats. That can be very challenging to do because of the fact that you, you know -- if say, for example, there’s agricultural fields in your community,
there’s a good chance that bees and other pollinators that are serving your area are traveling to those areas. And because of the fact that they’re getting exposed to neonicotinoids, they’re having trouble foraging, they’re having trouble navigating back to their home hives. These are the types of situations where we think it’s appropriate for communities to go beyond what the State prescribes if they choose to do so.

Again, a lot of the communities that I have been engaged with, um, are Fairfield County communities, areas where I’m not sure agricultural pesticides are as heavily in use. And so there’s a great interest in reducing the use of lawn care pesticides, ornamental pesticides, these types of things. But the fact remains that, I mean, you know, scientific community is in unison in many ways saying that the amount of pesticides, toxic chemicals that we’re using in our environment is causing a very real problem for pollinators as well as their public health, and we absolutely think that, you know, once again, towns that are interested in going beyond should be -- should have the right to do so.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, well I thank you for that answer, but you didn’t answer my question. Um, what is -- how is a farmer supposed to conduct business in multiple jurisdictions on his field?

LOUIS BURCH: Well, once again, I don’t -- respectfully, I don’t think that any of those jurisdictions are necessarily going to be requiring the farmer to use a certain product. We would encourage the farmer to err on the side of caution and to go with nontoxic means as best they can, um,
in all of their properties and all of their operations.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, so you don’t think that any of the towns will take the opportunity that this would afford them to regulate pesticides?

LOUIS BURCH: I certainly would hope that towns would take that opportunity and I encourage them to do so.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, so if -- if there is a farmer who’s got a corn field that spans three different towns, he’s got to apply three different types of pesticide on one field. And he’s gotta, each time, he’s gotta do part of a field, then he’s gotta empty his tank, try to wash it out in some way, so it doesn’t contaminate, put something else in, do another part of his field, and then go back again. Um, you see how that could be a significant problem?

LOUIS BURCH: I’ll take your word. I mean if you’ve had conversations with farmers in your district that, that see a problem here, we, once again, would prefer the less toxic route and encourage the farmer to look for ways to promote, once again, healthy soil and to produce their crops without the use of pesticides. There are reasonable ways to do that, very effective. You know, becoming more cost-effective over time as more and more organic and toxic-free land care is being done; and the demand for that kind of land care is growing. And so, perhaps there is more that the State can do. One of the things that we’re advocating for is the Healthy Soils Program, which will, once again, make resources, information and hopefully funding available to those farmers to promote soil health so
that they have to -- they don’t need as many pesticides. But I encourage you all to look at other opportunities including, you know, making information about toxic-free land care available to landscapers and members of the general public as well. There are great opportunities emerging in this realm. There’s experts here in the room today that can talk about that to great lengths.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): You said that, that there’s universal consensus with regard to some of this stuff, so why can’t we just do it at a State level, if there’s universal consensus? Why does it have to be done -- why -- obviously, if each town is going to regulate separately and mandate or prohibit something different, doesn’t sound like universal consensus to me.

LOUIS BURCH: Well, I mean, if you look at the history of how these pesticide preemption laws were put in place, it actually started with a town in Canada, um, Hudson -- Ontario Canada that passed local legislation prohibiting the use of lawn care pesticides. The pesticide industry was very effective the following year in getting preemption laws like this one passed in 11 different states here in the United State, including Connecticut. And so I see that at as, once again, a way for the industry to exert some control over this type of legislation. Understanding that it is significantly, I don’t want to say easier, but there are less hurdles in place to pass local legislation on these types of issues than there are to do it at the State level. They, you know, the industry is much better represented here in Hartford than they are in West Port, or in Hamden or what have you. And once again, as awareness around these types of
issues as the body of science, confirming that pesticides pose a risk to human health and the environment grow, we’re seeing more and more communities saying, we would like to do something about this, but we simply can’t because we’re not allowed to.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So your main focus is landscaping and lawn pesticides?

LOUIS BURCH: Our main focus is to promote a safer, healthier environment for our future generations, and this is one common sense way that we believe that we can help advance that issue.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Can you answer my question please?

LOUIS BURCH: No, again, that’s not our main -- landscaping and lawn care pesticides is just one piece of this pie. There’s a lot of chemicals that are being used in a lot of different settings, and we want to make sure that, one again, if towns are interested in advancing those type of productions, that they’re -- that they have the right to do so. It’s a very straight forward legislation.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Madam Chairman. So, I too don’t have to think too hard to find constituents that would frankly be in a jam. I have constituents whose home, home, not their property, not 500 acres of farmland, their house, actually
resides in two different communities. So that’s, that’s the real world problem with trying to imagine that this is the best approach to take. So, is there a different solution that you can think of where we wouldn’t be putting people at risk? I get that you’re -- you would prefer to see us use non -- well, I guess they’re lethal, I mean water will kill almost anything if you put enough of it on. So, there must be some other solution without us allowing the town of Goshen and the town of Litchfield to develop two different ordinances with regard to the use of pesticides.

LOUIS BURCH: My belief is that, that -- once again, as the public learns more about the impacts of these types of chemicals, you’re going to see more towns moving in that direction. Our hope is that Goshen and Litchfield will eventually end up in the same place. And that once again, the State will begin to promote safer, healthier methods of doing agriculture and doing land care, these types of things.

Once again, we’re simply saying that we want to make sure towns have the right.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): So Madam Chair, I -- I’ve got, I think as I told you, I got to go up to the Labor Committee and screen there. So there is no real world solution in your mind as to how we would deal with those problems where we have one parcel of property, two different communities, and two different ordinances. There is no solution to your mind.

LOUIS BURCH: It’s an interesting scenario that I haven’t fully considered until the two gentleman brought it up.
SENATOR MINER (30TH): All right, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Mr. Burch for your testimony. Next on the list is Brian Hurlburt from Connecticut Farm Bureau. Welcome.

BRIAN HURLBURT: Good evening members of the Environment Committee and thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today. For the record, I’m Brian Hurlburt, I’m the Executive Director of the Connecticut Farm Bureau Association. I am here to testify on a number of Bills on the agenda today, S.B. No. 76, H.B. No 1063, S.B. No. 1061, H.B. No. 7345, H.B. No 6646, and H.B. No 6647. Just a quick reminder, refresher for all of you, the Farm Bureau is a private non-profit membership organization representing nearly 3,000 Connecticut families dedicated to elevating the status of agriculture in our state through education, market promotion, and legislative advocacy. In our state, agriculture is made up over 6,000 small businesses, contributes $4 billion dollars through the state’s economy and employs 21,000 people and works 436,000 acres of land.

I’ll lead with the Bill that we signed up to testify on, S.B. No. 76, AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPALITIES TO RESTRICT THE USE OF PESTICIDES IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE MUNICIPALITY OR ON CERTAIN TYPES OF PROPERTIES. It’s significant important to have a consistent and uniform policy on pesticide application and regulation across the state. Many farmers, as was alluded to, and home owners operate cropping operations on multiple lands and multiple towns. I’m thinking of one dairy farmer in
Northeast Connecticut who operates on over 100 farms. And so those are not all in one community, those are generally spread out in a, you know, 6-8 or 10 town radius. So any -- any change in regulations or difference between the regulations does, as Representative Dubitsky was making the point earlier, create some challenges for that individual operate his or her small business.

Currently, DEEP oversees pesticide regulation and registration, it is our opinion that the Department has the knowledge, background, staff, and understanding of the regulatory process to continue to oversee pesticides. They also work closely with our federal regulators, which is vitally important to understand that there is that close relationship -- that there is a screening process both at the federal and state level that is applied here in Connecticut.

Moving on, I just want to acknowledge that we do support AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESTORATION OF FUNDS TO THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT ACCOUNT. The CIA has been a terrific success in supporting affordable housing, historic preservation farmland, and open-space preservation, Department of Agricultural programs and the Ag sustainability account, all of which is nicely written in my testimony here and since the timer off and there are plenty of people waiting, I’d be happy to answer questions from any of the members.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Hurlburt for your testimony. Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for coming in. Um, the license to apply
pesticides. Is that a local license or a state license?

BRIAN HURLBURT: I believe, and I’m sure some of the people who will be following me today, Representative Dubitsky could better answer this, but I believe that all that is done at the state level at DEEP.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And, you know, you mentioned that there were -- that the expertise is at the state level. Um, are you aware of any municipality that has the -- that has the expertise or the resources that DEEP has to determine pesticide use?

BRIAN HURLBURT: I am not. And I am aware though that municipalities are budget restricted just as much as the state is, and I’m not sure that passing this Bill would allow them to go out and acquire any expertise.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Which other Bills were you here to support?

BRIAN HURLBURT: Supporting S.B. No. 1061, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESTORATION OF FUNDS TO THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT ACCOUNT; H.B. No. 6646, AN ACT ESTABLISHING AN ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK; H.B. -- or S.B. No. 1063, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO IMPROVE FARM LAND AVAILABILITY FOR BEGINNING FARMERS. And also opposing H.B. No. 7345, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT ACCOUNT AND COMBATING INVASIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES. And No. 6647, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A REGENERATIVE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, tell me about that one, why are you opposed to that one?

BRIAN HURLBURT: The first reason, and I understand that there is some language being worked out that I didn’t see until earlier today, before -- or after I had submitted this testimony. But the first concerning thing from our perspective, is a lack of a definition of regenerative agriculture. Generally, again, we follow USDA guidelines on practices. And there are funds available and programs to encourage farmers to take advantage of those. I’m not sure how this would allow the State Department of Agriculture to work with the Federal U.S. Department of Agriculture on programming or if there would be conflict between the two.

The other question to one of the proponents of the Bill is, I’m not sure that what this Bill is trying to solve, that there exists a gap between State, Federal and non-profit organizations that do encourage and support farmers to try new and different methods of cropping and operating their farms. And so I would want to see what the gap is that we’re trying to meet with this proposal.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you. I appreciate your time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. I wonder if you could also, Mr. Hurlburt, talk -- speak a little bit about S.B. No. 1063, the taskforce to improve farm land availability. Could you just lay out for me what we think is the problem and perhaps do you think a taskforce could indeed help in finding solutions that would help bring beginning farmers to Connecticut.
BRIAN HURLBURT: So, that’s a great question. And Connecticut has had one of the highest percentage growths in new and beginning farmers according to last USDA Census of Agriculture. The challenge is that we’ve been consistent with that percentage growth, and so what that means, is that new and beginning farmers are entering agriculture and staying for under ten years; that’s the definition of a new and beginning farmer. So there’s a high rate of churn in that pool. So while we’re doing a great job attracting new farmers, we are not doing a great job of helping them become sustaining farmers. And one of the public policy goals of the Farm Bureau is to, you know, have middle-aged farmers, if you will, people who have started, have matured, have built their business plan and are able to continue to operate and provide for whatever life people have moved on to.

I do think there are a significant number of great resources both at the State Department of Agriculture, through the Farm Bureau, through UCONN Extension, through UFCA Programs, there’s a new Farmers.USDA.gov website that was launched a few years ago to catalog these different programs. I don’t know that there is a great in-state catalog of those programs. And I think if this taskforce, whether it be done through legislation or be done on our own as interested parties, to catalog what is there, what is missing, and what can be done to further increase and enhance the opportunity for new and beginning farmers. That would go very far in identifying some of the challenges that they face. But those programs, as I mentioned, are spread out between nonprofit organizations, state organizations, federal organizations, municipalities
have different programs available, the University of Connecticut. So it becomes a very challenging landscape for individuals to negotiate.

The USDA has launched a program called Bridges to Opportunity. This was a few years back, and what it was -- was really a navigation services for farmers as they came into their USDA office to help document, identify the needs of the individual, but then provide guidance and direction as to where that individual could go; knowing that the field staff at USDA had a lot of institutional knowledge as to what other programs were there. Not just USDA, but also local and state.

But again, we’d really need to catalog what’s there, and then identify where, you know, what we could come to the legislature with first, specific proposals that could increase the viability for new and beginning farmers.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. And you mentioned that there is a high percentage of new farmers, but after under ten years, they’re leaving. Is that typically due to financial sustainability reasons, they just -- or are the farms then sold and if it’s due to financial issues, unable to sustain that business, is there a case for actually not needing to have programs to get beginning farmers, but rather to help current farmers sustain what they have?

BRIAN HURLBURT: Mm-hmm. So, that’s -- I don’t know that there’s one reason why people don’t stay, you know, beyond the ten years. A significant reasoning is, you know, working a farm is hard work. You know it’s a 24/7, 365 days a year job. And so, um, there’s a lot of challenges to maintaining that.
Margins are very difficult in a state like Connecticut or really anywhere in the Northeast where you have higher input costs than our neighboring states and you’re competing for grocery store space with people who can ship it up from the south or internationally for cheaper than you can provide. There’s also a great demand in Connecticut from the consumers to have access to more locally produced foods. So, there is a market opportunity there. There are really, you know, the Farm Credit East, which is a great institutional, financial institutional partner in the State of Connecticut, it’s really the largest and only agricultural financial institution. They understand agriculture better than most of the commercial banks in the state, only because that’s their specialty; they’re a coop. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency provides access to capital for farmers who are higher risk, so they can either provide direct access through a direct loan or guarantee a loan through another financial institution. They generally do between $3 and $5 million dollars of loans a year.

So there are some of those opportunities, I think identifying if there are specific tools that need either to be better promoted to the new and beginning farmer population or if there are, again, gaps in access to that capital that we should seek to address that this sort of taskforce could help us identify.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, I appreciate that. Yes, Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Nice to see you Mr. Hurlburt. First of all I just want to –
- I, I, in the Northwest corner, I’m familiar, there are many farmers who farm very small plots of land in multiple towns, so, um, with respect to S.B. No. 76, I share your concern about making sure -- not complicating their lives. I wanted to ask a little bit about a follow up on the Chair’s questions about S.B. No. 1063, about farm land availability. And I wondered -- I know that we have a number of -- what the role of sort of private partner, private public partnership is here because there are a number of nonprofits that have been trying to either zone or, you know, use agricultural easements on property in order to ensure access for young farmers and how that affects this.

BRIAN HURLBURT: I think that’s what this taskforce could come up with and identify, you know, maybe it’s, you know, a set of recommendations to nonprofits, or municipalities that are trying to purchase farm land development rights, and then turn it into, you know, access for a new and beginning farmer, and how could that be best done. I don’t have the solution here today, but I think there are a lot of tools out there that we could do a better job of promoting and maybe enhancing that a taskforce like this could support.

REP. HORN (64TH): I mean, I’m aware -- having spoken to some young farmers in our community, there is at least a concern about, you know, attenuating their connection to their land and passing it on to their families, and I wondered if you could comment on that as a -- you know, because land values are so high in our neck of the woods and it’s a real challenge. We need to have as many tools in the tool chest as we can to give people access, but whether that is -- that prevents a challenge to you?
BRIAN HURLBURT: I think that’s an individual, an individual’s concern. You know, I do know that some people would like to own their farm, and operate on it, and there are certain criteria that they would like to be on that farm. I also know that, you know, many people have started their farm on rented land and been able to build out, you know, enough business and therefore, you know, be able to finance, you know, the purchase of a farm or work with a land owner for a long-term lease agreement. Those options are available. It’s up to the individual farmer/operator as to what’s the best fit for him or her and how they want to move forward. But there’s no -- I mean, it is not easy. You know, that’s -- that is the consistent, you know, theme. But I do think that there are some options, and again, maybe it’s just promoting some of those tools for people to consider as they enter their career in farming.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you Madam Chair. Thank you, for your coming and testifying today. You mentioned earlier I think with -- when Senator Cohen was addressing you something about sustainability criteria with farm, do you recall that? Is sustainability criteria, are they -- did you mean financial or did you mean regarding the environment?

BRIAN HURLBURT: Um, I, I don’t recall which specific time I used that. If you could give me [cross talk].
REP. MICHEL (146TH): S.B. No. 1063 for farm land, establishing a taskforce. I think there was some conversation earlier that made you raise out that there was some sustainability criteria, sustaina -- if you don’t recall, that’s okay. I can always. I won’t slow down the meeting, but I can come -- [cross talk].

BRIAN HURLBURT: I’d be happy to answer the question if we can think a little bit more on it, that would be -- certainly Representative.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, sorry about that. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Thank you, Mr. Hurlburt. Anthony Giovanni. Welcome.

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: Dear Chairwoman Cohen, and members of the Environment Committee, I’m Anthony Giovanni, I’m a General Manager of Modern Pest Services in Northford and the Vice President of the Connecticut Pest Control Association. Our trade group for over 110 structural pest control management companies in Connecticut, and our industry appreciates the opportunity to provide testimony opposing S.B. No. 76 and supporting H.B. No. 5999 to the Environment Committee.

Connecticut Pest Control Association strongly supports H.B. No. 5999 which seeks to provide the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection with adequate enforcement resources and the ability to close loopholes that allow unlicensed individuals to obtain restricted-use pesticides.
However, we strongly oppose S.B. No. 76 because it would create a quilt of pesticide regulations and local regulatory agencies that would dilute and weaken the enforcement ability of DEEP.

Dangerous and deadly pests do not respect political boundaries and travel freely across jurisdictions in Connecticut. The proposed differing pesticide regulations that would be permitted with the passage of S.B. No. 76 would exacerbate inequality, hinder the ability to adapt to climate change and harm public health.

Currently, across the United States and in Connecticut, low-income residents are exposed to bed bugs, cockroaches, mosquitoes and rodents at much higher rates than other populations. With the expected proliferation of mosquitoes, rodents, ticks, and other pests as a result of climate change, ensuring equal protection for the people of Connecticut in an environment with differing pesticide regulations will be challenging and troublesome to say the least.

Additionally, licensed structural pesticide applicators in Connecticut are already highly trained and certified by DEEP and implementing a crazy-quilt of pesticide regulations creates complications and is a hindrance for DEEP to be the chief pesticide regulator in Connecticut. DEEP has more expertise and resources to effectively enforce pesticide laws, crackdown on illegal operators and pesticide misuse. Therefore, we would prefer that DEEP regulate pesticides instead of local government because DEEP is incredibly more effective.

S.B. No. 76 will likely undermine Connecticut's landmark 2016 bed bug law (Public Act 16-51) that
requires free professional bed bug control for tenants in apartment buildings. This bed bug law has greatly improved the quality of life for Connecticut’s low-income residents, and people suffering from bed bug infestations.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, I appreciate your testimony. Does anybody on the Committee have, yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming in. I asked one of the other witnesses about this. Could you tell me about a pesticide applicator is licensed?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: Sure. The State of Connecticut has two levels; they have an operator level and a supervisory level both requiring tests. The supervisory level is actually one of the most stringent in the nation requiring both a test but in oral component that you need to go sit before a board.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And that’s done at the State level?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: Done at the State level.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Is there any licensing of pesticide applicators at the local level?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: There is not.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And it’s done through DEEP?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: It is done through DEEP.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And how are state licensed -- how are state licensed applicators --
um, how are they regulated? How are they, uh, who keeps an eye on them and how?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: Sure. So that’s done by DEEP at the state level, which is why we’re looking to make sure that they are properly funded with H.B. No. 5999. We have to keep copious amounts of records for what we do, and how we do it, and where we do it, and what was done. We have to report usage to the state on an annual basis. We have to continue to get recertification credits from them, and as a supervisor holder, if I have operators working for me, which I do, I have to oversee all of the work that they do as well.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And how many towns do you work in?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: We work in every single town in the State of Connecticut.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): How would it affect your business if every single town in Connecticut had a different set of regulations for application of pesticides?

ANTHONY GIOVANNI: It would be insane. We would need to obviously to comply, which we would. We would need to hire many more additional staff to make sure that we were complying with all the different regulations in different municipalities, and unfortunately, we’d need to pass that cost onto our consumers.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, thank

ERIN RICHMOND: Helen Senator Cohen, and everybody else on the Environmental Committee. My name is Erin Richmond and I oppose S.B. No. 76, AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPALITIES TO RESTRICT THE USE OF PESTICIDES IN CERTAIN AREAS OR ON CERTAIN TYPES OF PROPERTIES. I have also submitted written testimony.

I’ve been in the lawn care industry for the past ten years. I’ve cared for commercial, private and public properties during that time. I hold a supervisory 3A license with the DEEP, and I hold the utmost respect for that license because it is not easy to obtain. I am an Operations Manager at Lawn Doctor and we are serving Richfield, New Milford, Westbrook, managing about a 1000 customers. Our company employs 8-12 Connecticut residents each year, and each one of our employees is licensed by the State. Our management team has multiple categories of supervisory licenses and um, Lawn Doctor as a whole in the State of Connecticut has over 8000 customers, 140 zip codes and employing more than 75 Connecticut residents.

I take pride in the fact that we take a responsible approach to the business and invest tens of thousands of dollars into our equipment and training. The methods we use ensure that we will apply the correct amounts of material in the areas intended. We are incredibly safety focused and our sure to apply with the right rates and timing.
As a manager, one of my biggest tasks is product inventory. I spend an incredible amount of time researching products, reading labels, pricing out options and finding the best products to safely treat pests on our clients’ property. If municipalities are allowed to restrict that use, this will add more time to that research process, raise product and inventory costs, add time and expense to each service we provide and take me away from other important tasks such as safety training and quality control.

I have seen properties go from beautiful and health to dead and severely damaged in a matter of days due to insect and disease issues. If a town bans a pesticide completely, it could quickly lead properties to suffer. To my knowledge, there are no many cost-effective organic options out there. Instead of -- uh, let’s see, there are not many cost-effective options out there for organic pest control. They are usually extremely expensive, must be very specifically applied, and those costs will have to be sent over to my customers.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Ms. Richmond. Does the Committee have any questions or comments? Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. How do you determine the best practices to use with regards to pesticide application?

ERIN RICHMOND: Well, we always, um, follow by -- we use integrated passive management. We have both a corporate office that also helps us out and we do a lot of research on making sure that we’re using the right products and times, always reading labels and
things like that. Being very, very safety conscious about all of this.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And to what extend do you consult with or coordinate with the people at DEEP?

ERIN RICHMOND: Quite often. As often as we need to. We speak to them on simply a yearly basis when we’re licensing all of our operators. But any time that we have questions about regulations or where we can apply or what we can do, we contact DEEP, they do get back to us and we follow their letter and their law.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): And how many towns are you working in?

ERIN RICHMOND: I believe we -- my Lawn Doctor has 36 zip codes that we’re working at the Northwest corner of Connecticut, Ridgefield, Danbury, and then we have a stretch from Branford to Old Saybrook.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): All right. I’m sorry, did you say 36 towns?

ERIN RICHMOND: I believe. I believe there are 36. Yeah.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And how would your business be affected if you need to comply with the regulations of 36 different municipalities and coordinate with the regulators in 36 different towns.

ERIN RICHMOND: One of my main concerns is the amount of time that I will have to spend contacting all of these different towns and municipalities, taking me away from the main, you know, production that, you know that I have to deal with on a regular
basis. It definitely is going to raise costs. There are researched products that we’ve been using, you know, tried and true for years and if something like that gets banned, we’re going to have to go a more expensive alternative most -- alternative most likely and it will also just increase costs to my customers because if I then have to use something different, they’re going to have to end up paying more; which they’re already very extremely price sensitive in the industry that we’re in.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay, now, do your workers work in more than one town in a given day?

ERIN RICHMOND: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So how would they logistically do it if there were different pesticide requirements in each town, would you have to have multiple tanks? Would you have to wash them out? Would you have to go -- have your people go back to the shop after each application? How -- do you have any idea how that would even work?

ERIN RICHMOND: I’ve thought about this quite a bit. It would be a logistical nightmare and in my opinion, because if say the town of Roxbury and the town of Washington have two different regulations and it’s time to apply said material, we can’t cross those lines. We would have to go back and completely wash out everything. I mean the standard is to triple rinse your equipment or your containers that you’re using to make sure it’s fully cleared of that pesticide. I don’t -- we don’t have the time during the day to send my technicians back. We have towns that we treat and an hour and a half away from our shop, and we just don’t have the time to be able to do that. So I would have to end up limiting
production which is going to take more time overall to get said services done. Certain services that are very time effective. You know, you can only do certain things at certain times, so that’s going to stretch that out, which then is going to just put a damper on the business in general. You know, it’s going to make things a lot tougher for us when we’re already dealing with just all of -- all of the different environmental factors when it comes into the lawn care industry.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Have you submitted written testimony?

ERIN RICHMOND: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Did you address those issues that I just asked you about?

ERIN RICHMOND: I believe so, yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Well, if you didn’t, I would ask that you go back and make sure that it’s -- that you’ve got it in the written testimony.

ERIN RICHMOND: Yes.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions for Ms. Richmond? No, I think you’re all set. Thank you very much, appreciate it. So one more time, is Michael Flowers here? Okay, were going to skip onto Dan Golembeski to be followed by Steve Curry.

DAVID GOLEMBESKI: Good afternoon members of the Environment Committee. My name is David Golembeski, and I’m a life-long resident of New Milford and I’m
employed as a gold course Superintendent in the town of Southbury. I’m here to oppose S.B. No. 76. I equate my comments to one of the previous speakers who have opposed it for the same reason. You know, DEEP has the experts on pesticides, that’s where it belongs. If you think of this, um, the Representative talked about farm land in various towns and stuff like that. Think of it from a golf course perspective. You have a golf course that it’s in Town X, and Town X decides okay we’re going to go berserk on regulating this that and the other thing with pesticides, then you got -- next door you have town Y, you have a golf course in town Y. So you’ve got two golf courses who are essentially in competition for golfer’s business. Now if town X goes crazy with regulations, town Y does not, so golf course superintendent in town X -- they’re disenfranchised into using, you know, a laundry list of products that they normally use where the person in town in Y can, well, you know, there’s real no lack of fairness there. And then the other issue you run into, is you know, now the golf course in town X turns into having less desirable, you know, playable conditions where people don’t want to go there and play. Think of the economic impacts. That golf course is going to suffer because people are going to say, well, you know, word travels on the street, they’re going to go to the golf course in town Y because, you know it’s in great shape type of thing. So, you know, think of the economic impacts at the same time. And as it has already been stated, you know, municipalities don’t employ any trained and educated pesticide experts, you know. Who’s going to be responsible for these local regulations, you know, volunteer commissions, zoning, wetlands, conservation, the land use
enforcement officer. None of those people are experts in pesticides. In New Milford where I reside, the Mayor has been preaching a policy of how the town needs to do business differently due to the budgetary mess, you know, here and whatever with the state, you know. So, you know, we’re trying to combine jobs, do more with less, you know. I talked for a couple people who worked for the town and they said, you know, there’s no reason to give the control to the town, they don’t want it. They say, you know, it belongs here with the state. And we you know, we keep hearing about this regionalization push from the Governor’s office and such, and you know, how does having 169 different sets of regulations, you know, how does that promote regionalization, you know, with like the mosquito outbreaks you’ve had in the past, and stuff like that, you know. It’s a regional thing, it’s not a town thing.

In closing, I support H.B. No. 5999 with helping the more funding to DEEP and that’s it. I’ve also submitted written testimony.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, sir. I appreciate your testimony and I appreciate your hanging in there for the afternoon. Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Golembeski. And I apologize for getting your name wrong. It is David, right? David, okay. Thanks, David. No questions. All right, thank you sir, I appreciate it. So the next person is Steve Curry. Is Steve here? And I don’t imagine Michael Flowers is still here. Okay. So continuing on Bill 76, the next person is Rob Dorsch? Would Rob be here? No, okay. And how about Anne Hulick? Boy, we’re not doing too well here. Okay. Oh, she testified already? I don’t recall
that she did. No. Um, let’s see, so is Mr. Ball here? Ed Ball? Thank you, I’ll do that right now.

ED BALL: Good evening, Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco. Dear members of the Environmental Committee, this letter is in reference to Bill 76. Oh, excuse me, my name is Ed Ball, I’m a Sports Turf Field Manager. So Dear members of the Environmental Committee. This letter is in reference to Bill 75, AN ACT RESTRICTING THE USE OF PESTICIDES IN CERTAIN AREAS OR CERTAIN PROPERTIES, and expresses our concerns as an industry with the proposed regulations. We, the Board NESTMA, New England Supports Turf Managers Association, are carefully considering the public interest with regard to pesticide legislation. However, we believe that these regulations will be detrimental to the environmentally sound management of turf grass. It will be excessively costly and burdensome, will damage the economy of the area and will not achieve the objective of safe playing fields and green spaces in Connecticut.

There continues to be a value pertinent to research of pesticide free turf grass management investigated at the University of UCONN. We suggest that the legislators look to UCONN and other universities in this matter. In fact, our Chapter, along with the New England Regional Turf Grass Foundation has helped fund such viable turf grass research. New England Supports Managers Association welcomes the opportunity to continue to work with concerned members of the public to promote education and sound management practices that protect the environment without adversely affecting the quality of turf for turf playing fields.
So with that being said, I believe that the members here in Connecticut who belongs to New England Supports Turf Managers, uh, oppose this Bill S.B. No 76.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you very much, and thank you for your patience for waiting through the afternoon. Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Ball? No, oh, Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask you because one of the testifiers was concerned that there was pesticides applied on a park right adjacent to the Five Mile River down in Fairfield County. And they said it was a problem for aquatic organisms, fish, amphibians and so on. In your practice, do you keep a respectful distance from water ways?

ED BALL: In certain cases we do. And we use -- most of our top raters and members who have that Connecticut supervisory license through DEEP abide by the label and make the correct calculations and to make the application on those sports fields.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. So, maybe you don’t know the answer. But I wonder who this happened. I wonder how it happened that Pinkney Park, along the Five Mile River was, was treated with pesticides really close to the water. Is there no regulation that keeps that from happening?

ED BALL: I have no recollection down in that area, but I mean, again, they would have to be following the label through the supervisory license through the State. I mean that’s where the guidelines come from and we as members would certainly support
keeping, keeping the legislation and the laws through DEEP.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. I’ll ask DEEP then if they have any rule to require a set back from waterways. I’m going to ask them if I get a chance. Thank you.


LAURA CAHN: Hi, my name is Laura Cahn and I live in New Haven, where I Chair the Environmental Advisory Council, the City Board that deals with environmental issues, but I am here on behalf of myself today. To the Environmental Committee, Chairs Senator Cohen and Representative Demicco and members of the Committee. I support S.B. No. 76 and H.B 5999 and urge to support them. Please help local governments protect us from unnecessary pesticide exposure and allow citizens access to information about pesticides to which they’re exposed.

S.B. No. 76, neither the EPA nor DEEP is protecting us against harmful chemicals and pesticides, so we must act. A past Head of DEEP -- of the DEEP Pesticide program who came to DEEP from EPA assured me that Round Up, the most used herbicide was safe and not air born. Now glyphosate, the main ingredient in Round Up is on the World Health Organization list of possible carcinogens and is known to be air born. Monsanto, maker of Round Up
lost the first California lawsuit brought against it by a groundskeeper who applied Round Up and is dying of Non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma. Lawyers who went to the home of Monsanto’s head scientist to serve a subpoena caught her jumping over her back fence trying to evade them. A second trial is in progress in California and a woman in Florida just filed a billion dollar lawsuit against Bayer, which recently acquired Monsanto and other entities.

The Connecticut Agricultural experiment station which educates licensed pesticide applicators has a scientist whose entire research program involves glyphosate use. The growing of grass does not require Round Up or other carcinogenic herbicides such as 24D, a chemical in common use today that constituted 50% of the Vietnam War era’s Agent Orange. Connecticut municipalities should be able to restrict pesticides if our State and Federal Governments do not.

According to Senator Chris Murphy, Congress will not act to restrict chemicals until we take the initiative. Think of how much safer and healthier, we, our animals, plants and our air, soil and water will be without these poisons.

Without H.B. No. 5999, DEEP needs to be allotted funds to regulate pesticides, inspect for pesticides and enforce pesticide restrictions. We need access to information about pesticide use in our communities so we can limit our exposure to harmful chemicals without going to DEEP’s office and searching for boxes of paper records. I could go on. These are the records I got from DEEP one day. This is a minute portion I got, a stack, but that’s what you have to go through to get records.
REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you. So, I just have -- and I know other Committee members have questions. You’ve been here for most of the afternoon. You’ve heard the testimony that preceded yours. We’ve had several people testify on -- on S. B. No 76, and the difficulty that would result in having individual communities, individual towns having their own restrictions. I was wondering if you would like to respond to that, you know.

LAURA CAHN: Okay, two things. So, one, I am not opposed to pesticides for insect control. I am opposed to herbicides for lawn control and other things for lawn care. There are organic methods. I agree with Lou Burch, we have to find other methods that are safe. Round Up is not safe. It’s been found in vaccines, in kids urine, in breakfast cereals, in organic wine and beer, and it’s toxic, it kills people. Just because -- it’s not like plastic straws and you can’t see it, doesn’t mean it isn’t causing huge amounts of damage. Every step of the way from the manufacturer to the transport, to the sale, to the application, it’s hurting people. And whether or not these people who are applying it choose to believe it, they are going to end up sick from it.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, thank you. I think Representative Michel has a question for you.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for testifying today. Round Up is one, one -- I guess one formula?

LAURA CAHN: Yes, well it’s a brand name. But the main ingredient is glyphosate. It comes -- it can be bought under other brand names.
REP. MICHEL (146TH): It’s a brand name. And are they like -- I don’t know how to call them, but [inaudible - 03:04:21]molecules, but that would not be called glyphosate? Is that a very close to the -- the molecular structure of glyphosate?

LAURA CAHN: I think so, but they’re all very toxic. And so are the other several top used herbicides.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Yeah, I’m originally French, and I know in France they fought against various types of those chemicals and they can’t see the confusion that the companies would make other -- they just change something minute, and that doesn’t really change the effect of the chemical, to call it something else and then continue -- continuously have it. I want to thank you for your testimony and I think it’s important that we consider cleans way of, of, of caring for our land. I’m all about regenerative activities. Thank you.

LAURA CAHN: Yes, thank you.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. Representative Horn I believe has a question for your, Ms. Cahn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Sorry, you were so close. [laughing] I wanted to ask you about -- thank you for being here today -- about something you said a minute ago, you’re opposed to -- you were focusing on lawn care. I wondered if you could talk about invasive species and the management of them?

LAURA CAHN: Well, no organic lawn -- organic grounds care people recommend hand weeding things and, you know. I know it doesn’t work all the time. There are ways of getting things, there’s corn gluten
based weed seed suppressant you can put on your lawn for weeks to keep the weed seeds. There are things you can do and I agree, invasive species are a problem. I guess we’re going to have to just find safer ways. We have not gotten to the point where we’ve science research safer ways to get rid of these things, but they could if we weren’t selling millions and millions of gallons of carcinogenic week killers.

REP. HORN (64TH): And just to be clear, I mean, you went back in that answer to lawns. I mean invasive species aren’t just a problem in lawns. They’re a problem in much more, in fact, environment -- cause environmental hazards and all kinds of other situation.

LAURA CAHN: I understand.

REP. HORN (64TH): And I wanted to just ask, do you think there is ever any safe level of usage of glyphosate? Because there is a -- first of all there’s a distinction between Round Up and glyphosate.

LAURA CAHN: Yeah.

REP. HORN (64TH): I know it’s the active ingredient, but.

LAURA CAHN: Right. Um, I don’t believe there is. There is no safe use -- safe level of usage of that stuff. And I think you don’t find out until decades after you’ve used a little bit that maybe it’s caused you a problem. Do you want to live with that?

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay, thank you Representative. Any other questions for Ms. Cahn? No, all set, okay. Thank you very much, appreciate it. So, the next person on the list if Patrick Purdue to be followed by David Peterson. Are Mr. Purdue or Mr. Peterson here? Yes sir, there you go. Welcome.

DAVID PETERSON: Representative Demicco, Representative Harding, Senator Cohen I presume. I’m here to testify against S.B. 76, the preemption. And for many reason that I’ve heard and the questions by Representative Dubitsky, and Horn and Mushinsky. I’ve had my pesticide license, Custom Grounds as they call it since 1974. I’ve seen a lot of products come and go. I was here in 1983 when the first preemption law was passed in Connecticut. I was here again after 2000 -- in the year 2000’s when Senator Myers tried to repeal it again, and I’m here today.

For many reasons that we’ve already heard, and I’d like to summarize because I want to also speak about the ban of organophosphates that I don’t think anybody has addressed today. DEEP has -- they have the resources and the funding and the knowledge and the track record to preempt and to decide what’s best for the State of Connecticut. Pests know no boundaries. Diseased trees, dead trees can fall down in one town and cut a power grid out in the next town. Farmers with multiple fields in different towns or one field in several towns have a problem. I have a business that services the greater Hartford area, and I service 12 towns. So what would the burden on the towns? They would preempt themselves and be responsible for the regulation of pesticide registration, sales,
notification of use, advertising, marketing, distribution, applicator training and certification, storage, transportation, disposal, product formulation, and enforcement. I think that most towns would rather have the State that’s been doing it right since I can remember bear those costs and those burdens. Forty-three states currently have preemption laws in their statutes. It would create chaos to have as many as 169 different laws for Connecticut. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, all have preemption. So I would like you to accept the wisdom of your predecessors and vote against repeal and I’d be free to answer any questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Peterson. Yes, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for testifying today. I just wanted to know, do you consider the use of glyphosate safe?

DAVID PETERSON: Yes.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay, that’s it, Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Representative Mushinsky.

DAVID PETERSON: Can I say why?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Please.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Please, Mr. Peterson.

DAVID PETERSON: I don’t think it’s -- I couldn’t send one of my employees into a field of poison and hand pick it. I wouldn’t want our State employees going and picking poison ivy on our road sides. I wouldn’t want our State DOT people out of their trucks standing on the road with weed whackers when a safe alternative -- when you follow the label and
you use it properly is a wonderful substitute. And the amount of Round Up that’s been used over the years, for a long time, Round Up replaced chemicals that were much, much worse, paraquat and others that I used originally. It is much safer and it is -- even in the concentrate, it is less toxic than some of the products that you probably have under your kitchen sink.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Is glyphosate safer than, um, poison ivy? I mean since you mentioned that.

DAVID PETERSON: I would say that I would rather expose my child -- or myself to Round Up than I would the poison ivy.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay. Thank you.

DAVID PETERSON: Although, allergies have varying degrees. They might be more critical on one person than another.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): I think that sums it up for me, Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Okay. Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to ask you that same question about the riparian buffer zones along rivers and streams. There was real case here in one of the testimonies that Five Mile River was treated with pesticide along the banks of the river in one of the parks in the City Park, and that’s why they were looking for legislation to protect them. So are you -- in your business now, do you have to stay a certain number of feet away from lakes, ponds, and rivers, and streams?
DAVID PETERSON: Absolutely. Most of the --

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, what’s your -- what’s the distance you have to stand?

DAVID PETERSON: They vary from label-to-label. It depends on the product you use. It depends on the solubility of the product you use, the setbacks can range anywhere from 25 feet up to 50 or more feet. Again, the time of the application, when it’s not apt to be leached, is an operator decision. The product you use is an operating decision. But just like pollinators, now labels have a bee on the label saying that you should be concerned about pollen. The label gives -- each label of every registered pesticide has precautionary statements that include environmental issues, and if that product affects fish and shouldn’t be in water or bees or whatever, it’s contained in there. And that’s why a licensed professional that follows the label is apt to use these products safely.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, well how did it happen then? Is it that we’re not training the applicants well enough, or are we not policing them well enough? But how did it happen that this area alongside Five Mile River was sprayed?

DAVID PETERSON: It could have been a misapplication. It could have been operator error.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): They use the little yellow signs, that’s what tipped off the residents. You know, the little yellow spray --

DAVID PETERSON: The little yellow signs are -- they do upset some people. I take care of a daycare center that happens to be in the church that I go to
and when the people come in and out, you know, they’re concerned. Some of the mothers -- the soccer moms and stuff. But that’s a state statute that actually we fought in favor against many, many years ago. And in addition to that for my customers, I leave a hanger at the door telling them when it’s safe to reenter their property.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Well apparently there’s some kind of breakdown going on and I’m not sure how to fix it. If it’s by stronger enforcement or more clear rules about protecting water ways, or what we need to do, but, you know, there are some real violations out there that came to our attention, so that’s why the Bill is before us.

DAVID PETERSON: Well I think that one of the reasons our industry has been so successful is that we -- to get a supervisory license like I have, you have to -- it’s a stringent written exam and also followed by an oral exam that is done by DEEP. It is my responsibility to educate all of my operators with written instructions to follow my -- to make a proper application. And I’m not saying an accident can’t occur. Accidents do occur and in many other walks of life, there are unfortunate accidents that involve fire arms or fire or whatever. Poisoning for example. You know, you see these ads with the kids unscrewing the bottle of medications and the dog licking them all up. Those accidents happen. But they are few and far between and it doesn’t mean we should all not take prescription drugs.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, how about pollinators. Do you have any rules that, for example, say a town wants to set up a meadow and they put milk weed in there to attract monarch butterflies. Do you -- do
you respect the area of -- where the pollinators are so that they are not harmed?

DAVID PETERSON: Absolutely, and one of -- one of those, um, -- one of the issues in terms of nic -- neonicotinoids. That’s what it to the public’s attention. There was a misapplication made outside a CVS or some shopping center and the customers were so upset that the supervisor sent out his operator to treat a bunch of Linden trees that were in bloom. So the general rule of thumb, and the guidance that we’ve gotten from DEEP and on the label, is not to spray when any flower is in bloom. In the terms of turf situation, clover is often an issue. And pollinators visit clover. So in that case, we could use a non-pesticide cultural means by either spraying it when it’s not in bloom or mowing it, and then a day or two later, then go and the bees won’t visit where the clover is. So there are a lot of things that a licensed applicator can do and instruct his crew to do to eliminate a lot of these problems.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Horn. Sir, I’m sorry, we have a couple more questions Mr. Peterson.

REP. HORN (64TH): Sorry. I seem to be the one who [laughing]

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I think we have a couple -- a couple others. [laughing] Not just you.

DAVID PETERSON: I have plenty of time for you dear. I’ve been here all day.
REP. HORN (64TH): I -- you’ve been at this a long time, and I think you mentioned on this, but -- that or you may have mentioned this in the course of your testimony, that things have changed, our knowledge about chemicals have changes over that time, presumably. And so, you also -- you spoke about, you know, your own high level of certification. How often do you have to get that redone? How often do you have to recertify?

DAVID PETERSON: I have to be recertified every five years. But in the interim, we’re required to attend classes for recertification, and that speaks to the core manual on safety for the applicator. It talks about IPM. It talks about new -- we talk about organic methods, cultural methods to reduce the use of pesticides. And it also updates us from university professors about new products, safer products, less toxic products that are coming down the road for the tool box.

REP. HORN (64TH): Right, and focusing on just say the last five years or so as you, um, you know, get new scientific information and new methods. How much of that is mandatory and how much of that is discretionary?

DAVID PETERSON: Um, it’s pretty much up to the company that you choose, but best practices, the people that practice IPM and practice best management, are more likely to choose -- choose the best option available. We talked about the tool box. And I was ready to -- there’s chlorpyrifos, there’s a Bill about eliminating chlorpyrifos which is sold under the label Dursban. That’s been out and used for over 50 years. Now Connecticut wants to ban it. I’ve had symptoms of over exposure to
that particular product and I was prepared to testify today towards the ban of that. That’s one of the things that I think there have been so many improvements, so many safer improvements, that’s that one thing that we can do without. And it -- and it’s unbelievable. What I went through when I had it.

REP. HORN (64TH): I’m sorry to hear that experience. I’m glad you’re willing to share it with us.

DAVID PETERSON: Oh, I’m better now.

REP. HORN (64TH): Is there anything else, any other similar, you know, herbicides, pesticides that are permissible or quantities that are permissible that you wouldn’t advise today? Or you wouldn’t use?

DAVID PETERSON: I can’t really think of any. But I know that I just spent all day in a tic seminar and we were talking about Lyme disease and new tics to Connecticut and because of warm -- warmer seasons that there will be more -- maybe more pests and higher populations. And, uh, the different products, both natural based and synthetic products that are used for their control, in addition to how people can change their house to reduce tic habitats and put areas where children play like swings and playgrounds out in the open where tics aren’t likely to be. So that’s all part of education -- educating the public and my customers.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Reyes. Just a minute Mr. Peterson.
[laughing]. I’ll let you know. Representative.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Over here sir. Good after -- good evening now. Um, Thank you very much for your testimony. I’ve been all the ears over here and listening in. I just, just out of curiosity because I’m going to draw on your many years of expertise. Um, what -- what was the worst scenario -- scenario or worst scene that you’ve seen of anybody who actually has had a reaction since you mentioned a reaction?

DAVID PETERSON: I fortunately have not been personal witness to some of the bad reactions. But the ones that I’ve heard of have been related to people that not -- didn’t follow the label requirements or suggestions I should say in terms of personal protection. Or that did not read the label and didn’t mix it according to -- or there was a spill involved and they were exposed directly to the concentrated form and not to a diluted form that would actually be applied once it was used. Paraquat had a terrible reputation for being very, very toxic; like drops almost in the concentrated form. But once diluted, for the use it was labeled for, it wasn’t very toxic at all. There was a weed killer, that is you were mixing and it splashed in your eyes, it would cause personal blindness. Now I wasn’t personally aware of anybody that did that, but that made me say, well, we better put glasses on when we’re using this particular product.

REP. REYES (75TH): Sir, thank you very much for your honest answer. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Gucker.
REP. GUCKER (138TH): You must like me, you didn’t get up and try to run away. [laughing]

DAVID PETERSON: No, I had my instructions. [laughing] [background laughing] I haven’t been happily married for 41 years not to follow instructions from a woman I’ll tell ya.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): My girlfriend has been trying to get follow instructions for many years. I still can’t seem to get it down right. [laughing] Just real quick. Have you ever seen in your -- in your field, a buildup of pesticides in soil from application after application? You know, the soil getting loaded more and more with it?

DAVID PETERSON: Once, once that I can think of. We applied pre-emergent chemical to a bed and we did so to keep the weeds down and we had planted marigolds for years and years and years. Well this one pre-emergent herbicide, it root groomed. So after a buildup of a few years, the marigolds started not to grow like they did the first two or three years. But fortunately I knew what it was and I -- it didn’t happen again. So, yes, I have seen that.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Thank you very much for your testimony.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions from the Committee? Okay. Thank you, so much Mr. Peterson. Is Jason Brewer here? Welcome. Thanks for your patience.

JASON BREWER: Yeah, all right, I’m Jason Brewer, I’m an internationally certified arborist and I’m classified as a supervisory arborist in the State of Connecticut, and basically, um, let’s see. The
current -- current deal with the preemptions, that whoever is stricter between the Federal or the State, that would be adhered to. It’s also all -- at all times as an applicator, you have to prescribe the least toxic means. Um, I’m against -- I mean I’m with 5999, I’m with banning organophosphate, chlorpyrifos under 7346 Bill. But unfortunately, I’m looking at the structure of preemption and the movement towards banning all synthetic pesticides to only organics under Bill 76. And I’m going to say it’s straight up as trying to subvert the proper and earned channels of regulation by the Federal and State preemptions. Um, the outcome of Bill 76 would be a reduced efficacy in treatments for things that carry deadly pathogens like ticks and an increase in the price, so our most vulnerable populations would be impacted first and hardest. So, passing Bill 76 will lead to the suffering of our people. And that’s all there is to it. So as it would be said on the floor, no.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much Mr. Brewer. Does anyone have any comments or questions? No, seeing none, thanks so much. Is Christian Allyn here? Thank you, thanks for your patience.

CHRISTIAN ALLYN: Oh, thank you. Thank you for having me. My name is Christian Ally, I am a certified pest -- pesticide applicator and owner and operator of Invasive Plant Solutions, started in 2016 with a UCONN Idea Grant and participant in the UCONN Innovation Quest Business startup program. As human-caused pressures on the environment continue to shift and change, new threats and innovative ways to address those threats emerge. I am speaking in opposition of S.B. No. 76 because of one current threat that is destroying the balance of nature in
Connecticut; invasive plants. Invasive plants, not native plants that have proven to cause significant and severe harm to the environment, have been a priority of the State of Connecticut for decades. In my written testimony, which I have submitted to the Environment Committee, there are Connecticut general statutes that govern an invasive plant council and dictate that that council must submit a list of Connecticut invasive plants and update it every two years. The Connecticut invasive plant working group provides the best management practices for invasive plant management to home owners and lawn care professionals. Upon examination of how invasive plants corrupt the landscape of Connecticut’s environment, there is no sound argument for neglecting invasive plant infestations. According to one UCONN study, one acre without Japanese Barberry, an invasive plant, there are only ten ticks infected with the tick-born disease per acre. One acre with Japanese Barberry, that same invasive plant, has over 120 ticks infested with the tick-born disease per acre. Japanese knotweed, a non-native invasive plant, destroys foundations, rock walls, asphalt, and concrete and it’s present here in Bushnell Park right by the State Capital. If anyone would like to take a closer look at this picture, I’d be happy to pass it around.

And also Black Swallow Wart, a non-native invasive plant release allelopathic chemicals into the soil, poisoning the soil for native plants and has similar chemicals which poison Monarch butterfly larvae which could eventually lead to endangering and the extinction of that species.

All of these invasive plants that I have mentioned required the use of herbicides utilized through
integrated pest management for effective control. S.B. No. would hinder or halt the effective control of invasive plants throughout Connecticut. Well-meaning citizens and civic leaders could end up causing more harm to the environment than good by banning an herbicide which can effectively control invasive plants, then later be forced to remove such restrictions and address what grew to be massive infestations requiring more herbicide.

In order to protect Connecticut’s environment, oppose S.B. No. 76 and tackle invasive plants.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Allyn. Are there any questions? Yes, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you for testify today. So I guess you’re an expert with, with pesticides and herbicides. I just have a question. Is there any, any natural, um, product that could be used as in -- I mean I’ve heard [inaudible - 03:31:08] but I don’t know if it’s valid. But, maybe you can talk about that and let us know if there is any natural, um, ways to deal with this. As I understand the need to deal with invasive species. I have invasive species where I live, and I agree with that, we’re dealing with invasive species.

CHRISTIAN ALLYN: So there’s 72 invasive plants in Connecticut. All of those plants have different treatment methods, some can be treated mechanically, some can be treated biologically and some have to be treated chemically. Each invasive plant has a different time of year it has to be treated in order to follow best management practices and minimize habitat destruction. So for instance, for Japanese
knotweed, it actually requires the use of glyphosate in order to effectively treat it. It -- the specific timing for knotweed treatment is after August 15th, roughly, depending on the flowering time. So that August 15th, generally, in Connecticut is the end of flowering time for Japanese knotweed. From that point to frost, you could treat Japanese Knotweed with glyphosate. You do have to treat Japanese Knotweed for three to five years after the initial treatment. And in the UK, they actually follow that treatment protocol and have a national program for knotweed management. And they followup every knotweed site 10 years after the last speck of knotweed is seen on the property to ensure it’s gone, because they’ve had major property damage caused by knotweed.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And this is all -- also suggested I imagine by the DEEP as well? Your training comes from the DEEP.

CHRISTIAN ALLY: Yes. So I have a supervisory pesticide license like many of the previous speakers before me.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Okay, Thank you. Thank you for testifying today.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Yes, Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Nice to see you, Mr. Allyn, always. Coming from my and Senator Miner’s neck of the woods. I wanted to ask you if you could just sort of, um, give us a little context of the scale of the kind of invasive infestations you’re talking about. You know, it’s not just, you know, weeds in a lawn, it’s much more
extensive than that. I wondered if you could give us a better sense?

CHRISTIAN ALLYN: Absolutely. So, going back to the river question that was mentioned in previous speakers. Every -- nearly every river in Connecticut has Japanese knotweed along it and the reason why that is, is Japanese knotweed propagates through disturbance of the root system. So when people excavate on their property, and excavate into Japanese knotweed and then bring their backhoes somewhere else, they could bring Japanese knotweeds root cells along with them propagating a problem. When a river bank floods, Japanese knotweed roots are eroded and deposited into new locations. So that’s a huge problem. Black swallowwort is currently listed as what they call early detection and rapid response. So there’s some invasive plants that are only present in certain isolated areas in Connecticut and it’s imperative to catch them early because you could prevent severe echo system harm. So in the town of Salisbury and the town of Kent, I’ve been working with private property owners and municipal leaders and nonprofits to target black swallowwort in particular and catch it on all the properties that we know where it is and effectively treat it. Black swallowwort, by the way, has to be treated with either glyphosate or triclopyr. Triclopyr is an herbicide that has not been mentioned today. It is selective, so whereas glyphosate is a general use herbicide, so the glyphosate would kill broad leaves and grasses. Whereas the triclopyr would only kill broad leaves and not the grasses, so the triclopyr in particular provides a good management practice. But to go back to the scale the problem, invasive plants are
everywhere in Connecticut. They’re in every town. They’re causing havoc and it needs to be addressed quickly or else, we will face, possibly within my lifetime, echo system collapse. And in a state like Connecticut, where we value our environment, it’s imperative that we take on this task now before we face that possible impending doom.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative Horn. Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. A number of times I’ve tried to pass a ban on selling Japanese Barberry in Connecticut and failed because the nursery industry wants to keep selling it, but next time I do that, do you want to come and be my [cross talk].

CHRISTIAN ALLYN: Well, I’d be happy to, and actually just -- touching upon that point, because this is, this is something that I learned directly from one of my advisors at UCONN, Mark Brand, who’s one of Connecticut’s top plant breeders at UCONN. He actually grew a sterile barberry. And I’m not sure if it -- if the fertile barberry is banned yet.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): I’ve been trying and trying. I would like to only sell the sterile one in Connecticut. Not the fertile ones.

CHRISTIAN ALLEN: Yes. And I agree with you completely, that’s huge.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): I need your business card because next time [laughing] I bring this Bill, I’ve got to bring you back.
CHRISTIAN ALLYN: I would be happy to. Unfortunately my business cards are at the print shop because I ran out. But yeah, there we go, that would be great.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you for coming here.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

CHRISTIAN ALLYN: Oh, and also I have invasive plant booklets and fact sheets if any Committee members would like them.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much. You could probably leave some with our clerk over there, Robin[inaudible - 03:36:57]. Thank you. If, uh, I’m just going to see -- give one more chance here to Rod Dorsch, Anne Hulick, or Patrick Purdue, no? Okay. Moving one. I’m sorry for that, please come up.

TARA PRATT: Thank you. Sorry to interrupt, but you know, I just wanted to make sure I got to say my piece as well.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Could you just state your name into the microphone. Thank you.

TARA PRATT: Absolutely. My name is Tara Pratt, I’m the Director of Operations for Lawn Doctor of Richfield, Milford, Westbrook. Senator Cohen, Senator Miner, Representative Harding and the rest of the Committee, I am here to oppose S.B. No. 76. I am a single mom to the coolest little girl in the world. I’ve lived in Connecticut since I was five and I’ve worked in the lawn care industry for almost a decade. I currently hold a supervisory license
with the DEEP for mosquito and biting fly. The other managers in my company hold their supervisory licenses in the turf and ornamental field and every other employee that we employ obviously holds their applicator licenses. I take great pride in the level of safety and environmental consciousness of our company. We rely on the DEEP and their expertise to guide us on all regulations.

My concern with S.B. No. 76 is that it would not only pose potential issues for our current clients, some whose homes lie on town lines as been discussed, but also put us in a position where we are losing the level of knowledge we have with the DEEP. Each municipality would need to offer staff with the same expertise, and not make regulations strictly based on emotions. Our franchise system alone covers over 80% of the state and services only 8000 homes, which is approximately 16,000 voters, just for our company. The main concern should be focused on the individuals and businesses who do not obtain the proper licenses to apply these products and do not take the time to educate themselves on appropriate rates, timing and regulations. Our industry focuses on protecting our clients from pest-related diseases such as Lyme disease and working to improve their property by eliminating invasive and noxious plants.

The DEEP should be allowed any additional resources to continue their work in regulating these products. I want to emphasize that our company takes responsible approach to this business and invests tens of thousands of dollars into equipment and employee training.
Passage of this Bill will allow cities and towns to ban pesticides at the local level bypassing all State and Federal laws and regulations that have been in place for decades. This Bill could put all of Connecticut at risk as decisions could be made without scientific or research-based information. As was discussed by somebody else as well was the bedbug issue, and that’s my timer.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Ms. Pratt was it? Okay, thank you. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you. Thank you for coming today. How many employees do you have?

TARA PRATT: During our busiest season, we have up to 12 employees.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Okay. And how might this Bill affect your business and your ability to continue employing them?

TARA PRATT: Um, unfortunately it would probably cause us to logistically have to restructure the entire way we do business. Most of our products are in a pellet form and then as far as the liquids, we have such as a, you know, we would have still a limited amount of space to carry all the different products that might come up. So we would have a position of our employees who are going to not be able to do as much work and we would then have a situation where we would have to spend at least double the amount of time training because we need to make sure that each employee also is very cognizant of the different laws and regulations that each town might pass and you know, the last thing we want is to have anyone in any of the industries get
in a legal situation simply because, you know, they crossed a town line and you know, didn’t quite remember or wasn’t sure where to go, so it would put a -- an amazing amount of strain just on the business and on the employees. I would feel awful sending anyone of my guys out with that possible stress of, like, Oh, my God, you know, I’ve got to make sure I do the right thing in this town and that town. And you know, we have actual binders we keep in our vans that have very specific instructions as far as the different applications for the different rounds. Um, you know, so again, you’d be taking up the majority of your day just trying to stay on top of all those different regulations.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Okay, thank you very much for your response. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, sorry. How many different towns do you operate in?

TARA PRATT: We have 36 towns just in our franchise. There’s a total of six Lawn Doctor franchises in the State of Connecticut. So I know from speaking to them, overall, there’s at least over 75 different towns.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions, comments? All right, seeing none, thank you so much for your testimony and for speaking up. Assuming that nobody else is here to
testify on S.B. No. 76. Okay. So I’ll move on. And you signed up to testify on this Bill?

JEFF CORDULACK: I was going to testify on a Bill later in the evening, but I have comments on some of these [inaudible - 03:43:12] and I could complete my testimony on all the Bills at this time or I can wait.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Sure, if you want to combine the Bills together come on up. Just state your name for the microphone.

JEFF CORDULACK: Thank you kindly. My name is Jeff Cordulack. I am the former Executive Director of the Northeast Organic Farming Association. And that also entailed being responsible for the NOFA Organic Land Care program which provides accreditation for landscapers who choose to use organic methods. We are pretty sure that the best thing you can do is to start to regulate synthetic pesticides. Maybe not all of them right away all at once, but you need to start focusing on it. The results are coming in. S.B. No. 76 would be great step forward for Connecticut because that will allow towns to make decisions on their own, informed by the public with their own local needs, informed by their Health Departments, following the guidance from DEEP. If this law passes, it doesn’t mean everybody has to start changing their trucks, their formulations. At times, there will be towns that change their rules. So, what if we don’t pass a ban today chlorpyforis, well, there might be a town that might want to ban just that. That’s not a hindrance to some in the industry. When we have a ban on another type of application, let’s say it’s a glyphosate that’s regulated to use in a riparian area, and if we, as a
town don’t believe that science, and we want to particular riparian areas, at that point, the town will decide. It is American to go from the town to the State to the Feds. We should have home rule, and this industry imposed law from years ago is removing our American right to home rule. Give it back to the towns, let the small towns and the big towns decide what’s best for them.

In the case that was brought up before, where two -- where a property is in two towns, there was a request for a solution. The solution I might quickly suggest is, well, if you have a house or a property in two towns, and there’s a situation, well, then exempt that one property. If you have a farmer that has 12 properties that they farm, well, it’s very easy for a farmer to pick a different product within the group if a certain individual brand was banned or a formulation. So there’s definitely moves we can make and by banning in one town, if it influenced -- infected a farmer in another town then it might be a good thing for him to think that through and maybe he’ll switch to a less toxic formulation in all those towns. It does not mean everything is going to change when it passes. It just gives home rule back to us. And that’s the American way.

Today I really came up here, took time off of the farm, so that I could testify on a second Bill, H.B. No. 6647.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, I’m --

JEFF CORDULACK: On the soil spill, and I’ll be happy to wait to provide my testimony.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Well, we actually, you get three minutes total. So if you want to give us a quick sentence summary or two sentence or two summary on why you’re up here for 6647, go ahead and do that, and then we’ll take questions from the Committee.

JEFF CORDULACK: Thank you so much. I’ll be glad to do that. For the last 2-1/2 years, I’ve been working to bring new ideas together that farmers and organizations all across Connecticut can embrace. I’m here on behalf of the Northeast Organic Farming Association and on behalf of my good friend, and the founder of the Connecticut NOFA, Bill Duesing (phonetic). He unfortunately passed on this past year and so we are carrying on the work that we all started together. Healthy soils are integral for successful farming and unfortunately there’s been many ways that the soils have been beaten up over time. I’d be happy to entertain questions about how this Bill can change farming in Connecticut for the better and how this Bill can address climate change issues for the better, but out of respect for time, I’ll yield my time because I’ve put all my testimony, revised language for the Bill in with the Clerk and I believe that you’d be very happy to know that we’re not alone, there are dozens of states considering healthy soils legislation and that’s very encouraging. And today on the Governor’s desk in New Mexico there’s a Bill ready to be signed.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Terrific. Thanks so much, Mr. Cordulack and we will certainly take the time to review your written testimony so we have further explanation. I do think there’s some questions. Representative Michel.
REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Cordulack. You mentioned climate change goals, how -- how does this fit in achieving climate change goals?

JEFF CORDULACK: Well, as a career environmental science type of guy, I’ve spent my whole career, 20 some odd years trying to help people become more environmentally friendly. You know, to be honest in -- you could start to want to give up after a while. Four years ago I found hope and that’s when I discovered a new subject, it’s called soil carbon restoration. It’s a scientifically understood method. We’re basically, believe it or not, it’s the farmers and the land managers that could stash all the excessive carbon dioxide in the air right now, 400 parts/million. They could remove that by farming it back into the soil if they use new practices, and some old practices. They could do, imagine a world that decided to adopt the healthy soils practices of cover cropping and farm -- tilling a little bit less, and putting microbial inoculants out to get the soil life going. Imagine a world where farmers are doing that, because they aren’t doing it all over now. Many of the poor farmers think like that, but the industrial farmers are giving direct nutrients all the time. And so the soil microbes are being bypassed. In the new paradigm of carbon farming, we can allow the soil biology to thrive and thereby support the plants and when the plants are living, they’re collecting carbon dioxide, converting it to sugar and then exuding it through their roots into the soil in the form of carbohydrates where the microbes use it. If you don’t till the soil all the time, just less, then you will have carbon stashed in your soil. That
is not carbon dioxide in the air any longer. And it is carbon in the soil helping retain fertilizer run off and all of these things. It helps us through drought, it does many good things if you read the fact sheets on healthy soils practices, you’ll be like impressed. But what’s hard for people to believe is that the soil and the farmers can reverse climate change because to be honest we’ve only been given a solution, it’s turn out the lights and buckle your seatbelt, climate change is coming. Did anybody on this Committee or in this room know that farming it back into the soil is doable and if we converted all 13 million hectares in the world or billion hectares in the world farming and pasturing, all of the land in the world managed in this new method could suck up the carbon dioxide in five years to 280 parts per million. That’s preindustrial levels, that seems hard to believe, but I’ve provided to the Committee my testimony and supporting white papers to that effect.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Did you mean -- did you -- with the H.B. No. 6647, again, did you suggest -- are you suggesting a language change?

JEFF CORDULACK: I am. We have a -- I’m thrilled to be able to see the word regenerative agriculture on paper for this Committee, it really is something that Bill Duesing (phonetic) would be proud to see. But I’d like to see that changed. I don’t want to see regenerative agriculture or organic agriculture on it. I want to see healthy soils practices. My dream is to see a new tool, called a roller crimper out in the fields of Connecticut. Rolling down a rye cover crop about June 1st and then two hours later a no till transplanter popping pumpkin transplants into that field which are -- which are --
- either side of them is just a matt of grass. This is a new method. This is a method that’s being done in Woodstock, Connecticut by a chemical farmer. He has a roller crimper. My organic friends don’t even have them. But the point of the health soils Bill is to start a conversation to incentivize farmers to do these things because it’s one thing to know about a grant with NRCS or the Department of Agriculture that they can apply for, but it’s another thing to be rewarded for buying -- buying a special tool or for buying seed in the fall after your harvest and put it on the ground. There should be incentives for this because right now it’s just good ideas. And they’re there and I respect the Department of Agriculture’s point of view, and we’ve discussed that this short language doesn’t cut it, but I’ve submitted a six-page bit of language for you all to consider, that basically sets up a working group of sorts and action plan group. There’s no fiscal note the six-page Bill that I suggested unless its funded. The way it’s written is to set up a type of working group should the funds be available. They could come from an appropriation or they could come from, you know, a grant of sorts from acceptable means. Of course we can’t take private donations, but there’s plenty of grants out there. What would happen if we passed the health soils Bill, chemical farmers and organic farmers could go a be motivated to buy new tools that will tear up the soil less and encourage better products.

It’s a win for farmers to pass a health soils Bills that incentivizes these practices. And, you could start to quantify that and count that toward your climate change goals as well. It would literally count up.
There are 27 countries in the world that have signed onto this. The last page of my testimony shows the 4 per thousand graphic, you have black and white. This is color and it’s basically saying 27 countries have signed on and they are paying their farmers to just cover crop and roll it down and to do some different things instead of buying salty, fossil fuel based nutrients and bypass the microbes. Thank you.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Through you, Madam Chair, one quick questions. You heard testimonies before about glyphosate pesticide. I think you’re also knowledgeable on this. Can you -- is glyphosate safe? Or safer than poison ivy if I want to humor this?

JEFF CORDULACK: No, I’m sorry for that gentleman’s comment before. I’m sure he would rethink if he had an opportunity, maybe. No, glyphosate is not safer than poison ivy. And, it would be a shame to decide to live with glyphosate and cancer instead of changed habitat communities. If you’d like to ask me any of the tough questions on the invasive plant questions that you had, I’d like to go on and just say there are solutions for knotweed, barberry and all the like that are organic. They are non-synthetic. My organization that I used to be in charge of, the NOFA Organic Land Care Program has been hosting trainings to get people out to learn how to use -- All right, you want to solve knotweed, I’d like you to go out there in fall with horticultural vinegar 30 grain, inject it until it comes up, and leave. Come back like they do in Europe where they’re tracking all these infestations and revisiting them. Come back the next year, dig out what’s there, let it grow. In the fall come
back, inject it. The vinegar will dissolve the root mass. Why doesn’t the Connecticut Invasive Plants working group know about and endorse this yet? Because that hasn’t been exposed and researched at all. If you were to pass a Bill like S.B. No. 76, it would encourage further research into alternatives. If you pass a ban on the chloryprifos, I really would appreciate you all passing that ban. It was encouraging to hear even a synthetic chemical user feel concern. That is a very well-known threat. We tried to outlaw federally, unfortunately, our federal system has been coopted so we’re up to the state -- it’s up to the States to pass the Chloryprifos ban as well.

I hope I’ve helped to address some of the questions related to S.B. No. 76 and H.B. No. 6647.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Cordulack. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments from the Committee? No. Thank you, Mr. Cordulack.

JEFF CORDULACK: Thank you so much. Thank you for all the good work you’re doing.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay, moving on to H.B. No. 7346, which is, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE USE OF CERTAIN ORGANOPHOSPHATES. We have Bruce Gould. Okay. Tony Mitchell? Welcome. Thank you for your patience.

TONY MITCHELL: I think our patience must be nothing compared to you guys having to sit through this, oh. My name is Tony Mitchell. I work for Rivers Alliance of Connecticut. You guys usually see
Margaret Miner, our Executive Director here. She wanted to be here but she received an award today from the Connecticut Natural Resource Conference out in Yukon. So she's going to add to the other trophies on her wall. We have submitted comments in writing on ten, maybe half a dozen of the Bills and I'm not going to try and summarize what we said in those things, 'cause it's already in writing except for the one I asked to speak about, which was the chlorpyrifos. Many of the people who -- the few comments I saw that support the use of that chemical they often said that that particular organophosphate it isn't a problem with water systems, they say because it is the -- has low dissolvability in water. It is a neurotoxin, yes, but only if you get it on you and it is an issue they say because external toxicity. But they don't mention the breakdown product of that particular organophosphate is something, I think it's one, two, three chloropropane and that is a very water soluble carcinogen. It's being found in drinking water. It's being found in ground water. It's being found in many places and that goes in the ground and actually comes out in the rivers, that's why we ask you to ban the use of that particular organophosphate. I will ask the Committee's indulgence in that we did want to submit testimony on the two previous Bills that everyone else has talked about and somehow the email didn't work to go through so we're going to try to resubmit it and hope that you accept it even if it's past the time.

I just want to connect it to -- it seems that if you do ban the worst of these chemicals, and if you properly support the DEP pesticide following recommendations of the Council on Environmental
Quality. That Bill passing won't -- may eliminate a lot of the need for the Bill of allowing towns to set their own regulations about use of pesticides. And that -- if the state does their work -- with that delay then maybe we don't have to, but we urge you to pass the Bill allowing towns to set their own pesticide regulations as a promise that someone will protect the people of those towns. If the state's not going to do it by properly funding DEP's pesticide work, so if you don't pass the DEP support Bill with recommendations of the Council on Environmental Quality then you better pass the one allowing towns to do it if the state is not going to be able to do it because they -- they just don't have the funding.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Mitchell for your testimony. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for coming. And we've heard a lot of testimony this afternoon about the municipalities and the ability of those municipalities to find within themselves the expertise to set their own regulations. And you know, there's a piece of me that listens to the argument. I'm kind of a fundamentalist when it comes to saying you know, let the towns decide things for themselves. You know, why should the state keep telling the towns what to do? So I like that side of the story, but I am concerned from the standpoint of you know, we pass this and we throw it out there. How are the -- how are the towns going to take this responsibility on individually?
TONY MITCHELL My understanding is that Bill is they don't have to. They don't want to -- the point is that if the state DEP regulation of the pesticide industry, if they're fully funded, if they can keep track of it, if they can avoid the -- if they can prevent people from thinking they can apply an herbicide to a -- next to the Five Mile River, which has low flow in it anyway, then the town doesn't need to do it themselves. But a town that sees that that happens right now because perhaps, maybe not, the DEP didn't have the funding to do what they needed to do. And let's give the towns the authority to protect their people. If the states not going to do it, then by all means let's let the towns do it. But I agree, it will be a mess of regulations. I would not want to be in an industry where I had to have a different set of rules for each town. And I'm a -- I'm a conservation commission of one of Senator Miner's towns and I wouldn't want that responsibility to make a decision like that. I want -- I will -- I would want the advise from the state. I would want the state to say, no you can't do that here and here's the regulation to be able to enforce that. And if you read the CEQ's analysis of the pesticide law and enforcement you see that there's ways to fix it. We won't need -- we don't have to let the towns do the work if we can do it here at the state level, like banning chlorpyrifos.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam -- Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. So Mr. Mitchell, just so I can be clear. So you're saying that you would rather have the town -- you'd rather have the state use its expertise to make
these kinds of decisions but failing that, the towns should have the right to make the decisions with regards to pesticides?

TONY MITCHELL: Yes.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): If the state isn't going to do the job?

TONY MITCHELL: If the state -- if what the state is doing is inadequate then give it to the towns. Now, the question comes up --

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Even though the towns don't have the expertise? See this is where I'm struggling with this.

TONY MITCHELL: Someone has to do it.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay.

TONY MITCHELL: So yes, yes. Let the towns do it, or at least try. Now, if a town has a regulation there are processes that people can go through to have that ordinance or whatever withdrawing. If it doesn't scientific principal then there's lawsuit thing there. We certainly hope a town would not pass an ordinance that didn't make sense based on sound scientific processes.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay.

TONY MITCHELL: And we hope we see you all at the World Water Day Celebration here on Friday when several groups will be presenting and legislatures will be talking and basically we'll be celebrating water and a way we protect it.
REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Very good, sir. Thank you. Does any -- before you go, does anybody have any other questions? Nope, we're all set, thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Did you say Mr. Gold is gone for the day, Dr. Gold? Yes? Okay. Beth Beisel, Elizabeth Beisel. Sure, are you Diana Reeves? Okay. Why don't you come on up and then I -- unfortunately the testimony limit is three minutes, even with the combined testimony so why don't you give yours first and if there's time, otherwise we will certainly -- we'll be reviewing all the written testimony.

DIANA REEVES: Beth did submit written testimony.


DIANA REEVES: Thank you so much, Chairwoman Cohen, Chairman Demicco and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of HB 7346.

My name is Diana Reeves. I am the volunteer Executive Director of a Connecticut based 501c3 nonprofit called GMO Free USA. GMO Free USA’s mission is to advocate for clean food. We rely on industry-independent science and agroecological concepts to advocate for clean and healthy food and ecological systems. I don’t get paid for this work. I do it because of the importance to public health and to the health of future generations. In this context, I had a personal experience that motivates me.

In October 1983 shortly after I found out I was pregnant with my first child I had a significant
exposure to a so-called safe agricultural chemical, a pesticide. My son was born with cancer. He lived for 4 years, 7 months and 5 days before it took his life.

Studies document that chlorpyrifos is a highly toxic and endocrine disrupting pesticide. Industry-independent studies by credentialed scientists and physicians provide strong evidence for banning it. Even our own EPA, with its revolving door that opens to the agrichemical industry, scheduled chlorpyrifos to be banned because of its highly toxic effects on children from exposure both before and after birth, and on public health in general. Unfortunately, that revolving door led to the reversal of the chlorpyrifos ban.

In Connecticut, chlorpyrifos is used agriculturally on corn, soybeans, vegetables and fruits. There will be much testimony hopefully that has been submitted written forms on line presented about the documented harmful effects of chlorpyrifos. I would like to talk about the prevalence of this pesticide in the bodies of individuals who eat a conventional diet. In a recent study, four families from across the country were followed for two weeks. The first week, the families ate their typical diets of non-organic food. The following week, they ate completely organic. Urine samples taken over the course of the study were tested for pesticides and the chemicals that pesticides break down into. Chlorpyrifos was found in the urine of all family members, parents and children in the study at the end of the first week after eating conventional food. This toxin is prevalent in our conventional food supply. After only 6 days on an organic diet,
there was a 60% reduction in the level of pesticides in the urine of these families.

In 2010 the President's Cancer Panel weighed in on the health risks of endocrine disrupters and carcinogens to children, both before and after birth. It is by -- "it is vitally important to recognize that children are far more susceptible to damage from environmental carcinogens and endocrine disrupting compounds than adults." To the extent possible, parents and childcare providers should choose foods, house and garden products, safe spaces, toys, medicines and medical tests that will minimize children's exposures to toxins.

Ideally both women and men should avoid exposure to endocrine disrupting chemicals and known or suspected carcinogens prior to a child's conception and throughout pregnancy and early life when risk of damage is greatest. This an extremely strong statement that must be taken seriously. You can see why I worry so much about the effects of chlorpyrifos on our children. Thank you so much for the opportunity to testify and I would also like to add that I'm very grateful to have legislatures who prioritize the well-being of their constituents over the profits of chemical companies. I have faith that you will make the right decision and vote yes on HB 7346.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you Ms. Reeves and thank you for your compelling testimony. We appreciate it. Do any of the Committee members have any questions? Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH): Just a quick comment. I’m terribly sorry for what you went through and I
appreciate your bravery and your candor in coming here today.

DIANA REEVES: Thank you very much. Can I add quickly one more thing? Hawaii was the first state in the country in 2018 to ban chlorpyrifos and that's a state that has year-round four-season growing season and guess what? The sky didn't fall. So thank you so much.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you. I believe we're done with 7346. We'll move on to Senate Bill 585. The next person on the list is Cindy Davis. Welcome.

CINDY DAVIS: Yes, okay, so yes, hello, welcome. My name is Cindy Davis. Thank you for having us come forward. Thank you Julie, Senator Julie Kushner for putting this Bill forward. I know Julie -- Representative Julie Horn isn't here, but thank you.

I wanted to speak to the Committee because of my concern for the health of the residents in the -- in my Connecticut community and the surrounding communities. I am most concerned for the young children who will be impacted. This population is most impacted as will be pregnant mothers and the elderly because of the pollutants that will be released from Cricket Valley Energy -- Cricket Valley Energy, I can't remember. Center, okay. The emissions from the 1,100 megawatt natural gas fired plant, which is the largest in the tristate region, is going to an environmental and economic nightmare. The areas most effected are the bordering towns starting from Danbury and going up Sharon. It includes Kent, Warren, Washington, Cornwall and possibly Brookfield.
So I live in New Milford and in 1992 the Citing Council did not approve a 500 megawatt plant because of Litchfield County's topography and the microclimate. The Cricket Valley Energy Plant as I said before is 1,100 megawatts. This is 600 megawatts more and it is very disturbing and dangerous.

So what I want to also talk about is some of the errors that occurred with the -- with Cricket Valley. The first one is that when Cricket Valley -- let me -- I'll read my testimony. So a severe error occurred because the CT -- the Connecticut Energy and Environment and Energy Agencies were not able to participate in the three year review process for Cricket Valley. It was during the years of 2009 to 2012 that the -- these two agencies were being dismantled and it was being put into DEEP. Is that it?

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): If you could summarize, that would be great.

CINDY DAVIS: Oh my goodness gracious, it goes so quick. I had smaller -- so there's a -- there was another issue that occurred in New York state with aid to the Governor who was indicted for felony because of bribery and he was involved in the Cricket oversight during that time. So those -- so the regulate -- if these -- these -- if these processes were not done correctly the creation of Cricket or its approval is to be looked at. There were -- there were things that were done that did -- that did not regulate its -- its Cricket being able to be developed.

One last thing, I've already talked about the vulnerability factor but the NYSIO, which is a New
York Independent System Operator reported that New York state only needed an additional of 600 megawatts of generating by -- needed by 2027. So it's curious why all these plants are being developed when the -- when there's not a need. So that's what I want to say. And also I'm sorry. I belong to the Western Connecticut Clean Air Action, which is the -- someone else is going to give more testimony about it and they've got -- they've already purchased the monitoring devices to be able to regulate air quality because it wasn't done and that's part of what wasn't done before, so I'm going to let my other person to speak on it. It's very -- we're trying to make a difference. Thank you.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):  Hold on, hold on, hold on.

CINDY DAVIS:  Questions, oh sorry.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):  So I think Senator Kushner has a question for you.

CINDY DAVIS:  Sure, sure.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):  First of all it's great to see you here, Cindy and I appreciate you coming out because I know you've been here all day. This is a topic we've talked about at length in the past. And you know, I know that you all had talked to DEEP last year about doing an air quality study. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about what happened when that request was made by the residents.

CINDY DAVIS:  Well that's a good question and I -- I know that DEEP came to Kent and they presented but I know that a lot of questions -- that DEEP did not give the information that it needed to. There was a
lot of information that wasn't provided resulting in -- and I joined the Western Connecticut Clean Air Action after it was begun, but because the people who came from DEEP were not able to provide the information that was needed, it then became this citizen's action group. And let me say that this citizen's action group is the only one in the nation that is taking the initiative to do the air monitoring because DEEP wasn't able to follow through because they didn't have the funding. So that was -- that was the impedes for this group to come together to then work with somebody from DEEP to be able to buy the air monitoring equipment. There's going to be one major piece of equipment that was more expensive that's going to be in Kent and then the subsequent -- and then surrounding areas are going to have the satellite equipment to do it. So DEEP wasn't able to give the information that was needed. I don't mean to go on, it's just that you asked a really question. Yeah.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): That's okay. I -- let me just clarify for myself. I think I -- I have been following this pretty closely. When they first started building the power plant, first of all I don't know if I'm correct but I believe it's about eight miles from Sherman. It's on the New York -- it's in New York state but it's located so close to the border that it's only eight miles from Sherman, Connecticut is that -- that's right, right?

CINDY DAVIS: Well I think it's -- you know I don't have that information. You know I know it's three miles I think from Gaylord, well maybe eight -- three miles, it's very, very, very close.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): Yeah, very close.
CINDY DAVIS: Yes.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): So I know the community there got pretty unhappy about the development of the power plant and there were -- I went to some of those forums where people came from New York and talked about the pollution that they've faced in other parts of New York where these power plants already exist and I think you mentioned that. But I -- what I remember hearing last summer is that when DEEP came and was asked about doing an air quality study prior to opening of the plant, prior to them going on line there was some concern by DEEP about the amount of money it would cost to do such a study or monitor it. And you mentioned that they're talking about putting equipment in Kent. But as I understand it, that equipment has been purchased by the Kent school and is not currently part of the State of Connecticut's money.

CINDY DAVIS: No. So yes, that is true and it was -- again, it was Western Connecticut Clean Air Action that has worked with Kent to make a significant purchase and then the Conservation Committees in the surrounding towns that have purchase -- that have worked with the community. Sherman approved it with their Selectman. So it's been an initiative of a community action to get the equipment to do it. Yes, go on.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): So I did get asked this question by someone. If the community has already purchased the equipment and is doing a study, and by the way I don't think it was that expensive, some folks asked me why I promoted this Bill and one of my concerns and -- is that it's not done through the State of Connecticut or the results of any study
done by a community group or a community organization going to be considered the kinds of verifiable results that they want to do a study down the line when perhaps there's real ramifications of pollution in our communities because of the power plant going on line. So I know that was one of my concerns and one of my reasons for wanting to see us take up this Bill, because I think it is our responsible -- our responsibility as a state to make sure that any study that's being done is being done with the parameters and the criteria that would be required to have a verifiable you know, very clear study of air quality conditions in our part of the state.

CINDY DAVIS: So I know this -- someone else will be speaking on this as well. With the Cricket -- with the Western Connecticut -- the W -- Western Connecticut Clean Air Action would like is to be able to work and with the -- with CT to get a scientist, somebody who is knowledgeable to be able to do the data if that's -- you know, that's the point they're at right now because the data -- to create the baseline of this information before Cricket goes on line is what will be the determining factor as to the air quality. And what is in our discussion is, okay so we need to find a knowledgeable scientist who can begin to get that data and do the analysis that's needed. And that -- and that was part of what -- an action is to approach you guys and say, can you work with us to do that even? Because -- because DEEP wasn't going to have the money to do this. And the -- the most expensive machine or air quality airflow, I'm not remembering the name, was $47,000.
SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): Right. So I -- I know I really appreciate your being here. I know there's going to be more testimony.

CINDY DAVIS: Right, yes, yes.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): And more opportunity but there may be other questions from other Committee members, so don't get up yet.

CINDY DAVIS: Okay, okay.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): This is your first time doing this I bet?

CINDY DAVIS: It's the first time I've ever testified and I thank you. And it's been interesting. (Laughing) Okay.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Representative Horn, did you have a question? Okay. Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CINDY DAVIS: Well and thank you for supporting the Bill too.

REP. HORN (64TH): Yes, well and I'm sorry I missed the first few seconds of your testimony. I was listening and I sprinted back so that I could be here for it. Just to followup on some of Senator Kushner's questions. My understanding of the current drafting of the Bill, it would still be useful for towns like -- for example that have funded it on their own to still have access to technical assistance going forward. You know, scientists or you know calibration of equipment or things like that. Is that your understanding as well?
CINDY DAVIS: That's a very good question. The calibration is being done with the company that does the air monitoring and I don't think DEEP is involved in that piece of it. It's really -- the most crucial part at this point is having the scientist, the person whose most knowledgeable to be able to do the analysis of the air quality from this point forth.

REP. HORN (64TH): And I wanted -- we had intent in particular, a number of towns we had a lot of conversations and meetings about this.

CINDY DAVIS: Sure.

REP. HORN (64TH): And I'm sure we'll continue with this in a moment but about -- there were some questions as to whether or not we were measuring all the things that we ought to be measuring.

CINDY DAVIS: That is true.

REP. HORN (64TH): You know are -- can towns -- is that an issue? I mean is the -- is the state able to provide technical assistance in a way that allows towns or helps towns to measure for example the ultra -- ultrafine particles, very, very small particulate matter which are of some concern. And there was some question as to whether that was being measured appropriately at all.

CINDY DAVIS: That is true, yeah. In the discussions -- and I'm not -- this is my first introduction to all these pollutants that are -- and emissions that are in the air. So there is a question as to what will be detected, and they're not going to be able to do the analysis with the really fine particulates but it will identify -- I
think if I can look here, I have written down what those three week. So what I wrote down was nitrogen oxides, and then there's volatile organic compound so I didn't go into as much details as to what they were. But yes, and I think there are people who have written testimony to give more information about this as well, from the Western Connecticut Clean Air Action, so I hope I answered questions as best as I could. Okay.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, Mr. or Madam Chair, whoever's turn.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): All set Representative?

REP. HORN (64TH): Yes, thank you.

CINDY DAVIS: Thank you, sure.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Does anybody have, oh, wait a minute. Before you go. Wow, you're -- you're a popular testifier today. Representative Gucker has a question for you.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): I would think without Representative Michel here I'd be easier to see. (Laughing)

CINDY DAVIS: Actually it's very nice to see some of my -- you know Representatives and Senators that I supported. It's very exciting to me. I love it.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Well next time you have to be here, bring a lot of coffee for us since it's so late so we can continue with the testimonies. Just kidding, just kidding. (Laughing) I want to thank you for coming out. So you know, scientifically based here I'm going to ask you a couple, probably loaded questions, but --
CINDY DAVIS: Oh dear.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Ones I'm sure that you can handle. So number one, any scientific experiment needs a base -- a base number to start with. So would you say that you would need to get this program off the ground sooner rather than later so that you can get -- first of all, when does -- when does the plant go on line?

CINDY DAVIS: Well actually the plant is going -- it's going -- the first -- it's going to be going ahead of schedule. It's going to be going in November 19 -- of 20 -- of 2019. It was supposed to be 2020, but it's ahead of schedule. So this one -- one portion of it is already set to go. So in response the air monitoring devices are going to be received very shortly. So we're going to have it from -- from maybe in a couple of weeks until November to do the -- to start doing the data collection.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): And if I could, so you'll be able to get those baseline numbers so that you know what the particulates are going to be?

CINDY DAVIS: They're going to start -- they're going to start recording all that information as soon as those machines are received and set up, and that's going -- not going to take a lot of time at all.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Now with these machines, they would be ones that the State of Connecticut will recognize as being what they would use so that there's nothing down the line to say that, well the data that you've collected beforehand with these coming machines might -- if this Bill goes through
and the state gets involved with it, they'll use your machinery or they'll use your --

CINDY DAVIS: So it's -- I have truly appreciate working on this Committee because the people who are more scientific and knowledgeable than me have done or their due diligence to -- to work with the state, to work with somebody from DEEP to know what machines to purchase so they meet DEEP's standards. I mean it's been -- they have done -- they have done an incredibly thorough job to make sure they're doing the due diligence that DEEP wasn't able to do and spend the money to get the right machines. And to be able to set it up in various locations throughout this area -- you know, Litchfield, to be able to get data from all the different sources with the winds, the changing winds. And that was another part of the conversation as to what would be the best location.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Okay. So once we can get this through, it will back up what you've already started. I just want to make sure we don't get any, I don't want to say repetition but you were starting this project and then the state, if this comes through says, by the way we don't recognize your data and I want to make sure that we're helping you as much as you can to make sure that when this comes on -- if this goes through the Committee and goes through the House so that what you're doing will be viable. I know sometimes when it comes to scientific studies if the baseline does not accept it, then there's an argument as to what actually is the -- is the impact going forward. So you know, it's good that you're starting this.
CINDY DAVIS: I'm -- I'm just part of the -- but I think you raised a really good point and I would say that it might be beneficial and I know Senator Kushner has attended these events so she knows, and I think Representative Horn as well has been in touch with many of the people so you know whose been involved with it. So it might work really well to work with those people so that they -- Michael Benjamin is the Chairperson, and just really even create a much stronger alliance. How can that be done maybe is the issue? So to move this Bill forward and then make it -- make it law, at that point working with the -- with -- with our -- the people on this Committee to move it forward. And again, I think the plea from the organization is to find a scientist who can work and do that analysis. That would be the ultimate. Does that make sense?

REP. GUCKER (138TH): No, that makes a lot of sense. My statements were more along the line if I want to make sure from a scientific basis that we one, are helping you. Two, you have a baseline to start with. Three, (inaudible - 04:29:33). 'Cause as many of in the room don't -- may not know of the situation, we --

CINDY DAVIS: Correct.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): We all basically, the State of Connecticut will be living downwind from this project so even though Kent and Sherman and New Fairfield, etc., are the first line of defense, it's going to continue right through the rest of the state and I think it's important that we -- we know what we're getting into and we also -- we understand that this is not just a regional thing, this could be a statewide thing as well. So I want to thank
you for -- for sitting here all day and testifying. You did pretty good.

CINDY DAVIS: Well, you know again, thank you for making this a Bill and moving this forward. And then -- I mean for me, I would like the state to be able to have greater jurisdiction over what another state does when it creates this -- this massive plant and then the state of Connecticut and all the bordering communities are impacted by it. Now maybe that's a federal legislation but I think the state needs to be more on topic, which is why I was talking about the fact that DEEP didn't do its job when there was the dismantling and then the other piece is that there was no -- there -- there was -- there was fraud created with the numbers at a different plant so how valid are those -- how valid are those numbers? I mean those are issues that need to be looked at even more seriously. Okay. Am I done?

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thanks Ms. Davis. You all set, Representative?

REP. GUCKER (138TH): I was just going to say you summed it up exactly what I was saying. That's why you need the baseline to start when they're not fired up to compare with what -- everything that's coming forward afterwards so that regardless of what's happened in the past with the DEEP or what's happened with the analysis --

CINDY DAVIS: Correct.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): When you have -- you know this is a nice state without the power plant and here it is on a regular basis, I think that's where you're -- you're doing that now, so.
CINDY DAVIS: Well that was the -- that was this organization. That's the only citizen's group in the nation that has ever done it.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Ms. Davis. Thank you. So next person is Pat Bailey. Welcome.

PAT BAILEY: Thank you for giving us this opportunity to voice our concerns. I'm Patricia Bailey from Sherman, Connecticut and I support Bill No. 585 and hope you will find funding to support this Bill and also to include the whole state to monitoring their air, not just the Cricket Valley Energy Plant. I'm a member of the Western Connecticut Clean Air Action, WCCAA and some people call Connecticut the tailpipe of the northeast and that's because the jet stream brings the air from the west coast and we get all that pollution from the forest fires out west and it comes into Connecticut and also the air comes up from the coast line so I suppose we get Atlanta's traffic and car pollution and so on, up to Station Island, Long Island, New York and it all comes -- Connecticut is hanging out there and we catch it.

So the American Lung Association has given seven of Connecticut's eight counties an F as in failed rating. WCCAA members are very concerned about our air quality and have purchased air monitoring equipment for placement in Kent, Washington, Cornwall and Sherman. Citizens from other towns are also considering purchasing equipment to join us in monitoring the air from Cricket Valley, which is a power plant on Route 22 in Dover, New York. However, we need somebody to be able to interpret the data that we collect. Obviously this would need to be somebody that's highly educated, a PhD and we
would require a salary competitive with the very deep pockets of the energy industry. We surely hope that Bill No. 585 will include financial support to hire a well-educated individual to monitor and interpret the data collected.

DEEP is supportive of us but the -- a large sharp cutbacks in their fundings and the layoffs over the past several years, we feel they're already overburdened. The projected increase in illnesses to Connecticut citizens from fracking plants will increase the demands on the health department, not to mention the citizens of Connecticut and the overall health of this state.

With multiyear cutbacks and funding we don't see DEEP or the health department able to assist us in this important quality of life issue, indeed our very health and wellbeing. Also with the potential of additional fracking plants coming on line you know, New York state is expanding several of their plants, so Bill No. 585 should not be limited just to Cricket Valley but to include power plants over the entire state.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Ms. Bailey, if I could just ask you to summarize because the -- the bell went off. Thank you.

PAT BAILEY: Oh, okay. So my time's up? Okay. Are there questions?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, I think there are some questions. Senator Kushner. Well thank you for coming. I've seen you at a number of the meetings in the area and just Saturday I saw you as well in Sherman and I appreciate when our constituents come here and really make it you know, really raise the
awareness about these issues. I do want to say that the organization that you had been mentioning and Cindy mentioned before, one of the things that has really impressed me is the number of scientists that have been involved in really trying to help us understand the nature of this problem and how important it is that we get on top of it now. And you know, I appreciate Representative Gucker bringing up the timeliness of this question because it's going to start soon and we don't have any time to lose on this. I do know that there's been a -- I saw some of the scientific data that was generated from New York and other problems that they've had in New York and I want to say that your activity on this has not only raised awareness around it, but I think you're putting us in a position where we have to do something so I appreciate your efforts on this. I know that it's going to cost some money to do this but I don't see how we, as a state, you know ignore this problem because it's going to affect so many of our residents. I do want to ask, you raised something in your comments that you would like to see this fee done beyond the immediate area that's impacted so I wondered if you could just speak a little bit more about that?

PAT BAILEY: Yes, on -- in the next couple of weeks the City Council is deciding on an application for a new 650 megawatt dual fuel gas plant in Killingly, Connecticut in addition to an already existing power plant in Killingly. And somebody told me that what the states do is they always put litterers or pollution thing on the edge of the state so it could blow into the next state and won't be a problem. And so that's what Connecticut is doing to Rhode Island. And that's what you know, the coal burning
plants out in the west that produced a lot of electricity, that was all blowing into us. So you know, these are all big concerns for everything and the health is -- to answer your question, there are more sensitive machines but the more sensitive you get to be able to get the smallest particles and identify things the more inaccurate they are just because they're so sensitive. So I said to the man that is selling these things, I said you know, spring is coming and you know the pollen falls all over your trees. Well they're going to get it in all the filters on these machines and these things -- the filters have to be changed and so on so forth, so yes, there are many, many things you could do but you know, you only have so many dollars and as you guys all know and that's an issue. But I do know that the very small particles that these are making go deep into your lungs and it gets into your bloodstream and they believe that some of this is causing difficulties in fetus development and especially in brain development. And China I know is doing a big study on this on their babies because of retardation and stuff that comes up from this stuff. So it gets deep into your lungs now, so it's a big problem. And then you know the cost expense for the health -- for you know, on the state would be enormous and people won't be able to work when they're you know, in their 40s and 50s if you had to stop working because your lungs are shot.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Oh, Representative Horn.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for being here today. I want to join Senator Kushner in saying, in the course of the many meetings I went to about this I was always impressed by how many really informed, smart scientists who
were in the room who had really good information and it was -- I learned a lot from them. I wanted to focus on you know, Representative Gucker talked about you know, baseline monitoring but what it is we're doing with this information. Because in the absence really or the unreliability of a federal response, which would be better because as you've all noted pollution doesn't stop at state boundaries. But in the absence of that, for me the focus is what -- how can Connecticut be effective? And it seems to me that what we are doing with this information in order -- you know providing really good data, is that we are making easier for a remedy which is effectively a suit or a threat of a suit against New York or against you know, when something, when we can demonstrate that -- that all the promises that were made about what's -- what was not going to happen, actually happened and what to do about it. Is that your understanding too of what we're doing with the data or do you have a broader understanding of what -- what the data is for?

PAT BAILEY: You know, I don't know how to answer your question. I'm severe to profoundly deaf. I have a cochlear implant and my hearing aid. I have a terrible time understanding speech, but you know I think, our group is not a protest group. We're strictly looking at the information and we're going to make our scientific information available to the public so other people will be able to review it. So I -- I don't know what the next step is that we're going to be doing, but --

REP. HORN (64TH): But this is the first step.

PAT BAILEY: We're looking.

REP. HORN (64TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Representative Gucker.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Hello again. Thank you for coming up from Sherman. A couple of quick questions. I know you're looking for a scientist to be able to digest all this information and make sense of it. Could the Connecticut Ag Center help you with that? Have you reached out to them?

PAT BAILEY: Could the Connecticut what?

REP. GUCKER (138TH): The Agricultural Center. I know they do monitoring and such for Candlewood Lake when we're dealing with some of the issues with Candlewood Lake. Do they do anything with their --

PAT BAILEY: I know -- I know they're looking in a couple of places to find somebody to -- to perhaps works for this project. You know, we don't have the funding to hire somebody right now. We're just -- we have zero dollars. This is just people out there.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): If I could, so what -- so what I'm thinking is instead of having to say hire somebody, which of course will probably be more costly in the long run, if the Connecticut Agricultural Center is already doing an air quality monitoring program, if we could find funding to have them say digest your information. I'm not sure. It's just something I'm throwing out there 'cause I'm sure what's going to be brought up later is the fiscal note of this Bill. And if this is -- and if this is another alternative as opposed to a fresh hire you know, going through them, if that would work.
PAT BAILEY: I'll bring your suggestion to their attention. I don't know if the credentials that somebody would have in the Agricultural would be equal to what is being produced from this kind of science that they're doing. And also the impact that it would have on human health.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): And if I could, now you said it was -- this is a -- it's a fracking plant, so they're using fracked gas or they're actually, excuse me, they're not fracking, they're using a fracked product. Yes, the, I assume, I'm pretty sure of this fracked material is coming from Pennsylvania and it's coming over the pipelines and the pipelines in Connecticut -- Connecticut has 590 miles of pipelines and the pipelines are all going either down to Long Island Sound or it could go up to the Saint Lawrence Seaway and a lot of this stuff is going to be exported. So we're getting the pollution and the price of gas in -- in Paris and London is much higher but they pay per liter is you know more I think than what we pay for a gallon. So you know, I don't think a lot of this stuff is coming to us. I think some of this is going to perhaps help, but it could very well be exported to far end places.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): And lastly, I did a quick research on this type of power plant, CPV flack gas power plants. They did one in New York and what they found was that it was releasing 43 times the emissions as a compressor station. So that kind of further pushes the importance of you know, we can't stop New York from what they're doing but if I think if through your project, if we can show how this is negatively impacting those residents in Connecticut that maybe some pressure could be put back on them
or possibly maybe push you know, our federal legislatures to possibly do something. But again, like we said earlier, having the scientific base that you're starting with, what we had before, what we have during, what we have after.

PAT BAILEY: Another thing is, also is you know how they have to clean out water mains and they do whatever they do and you get brown water in your faucet for -- momentarily, you know for a short time and it's okay. But they have to clean these pipelines and they do that at 10 mile sections. And you cannot taste this, you can't see it, you can't smell it and you could go out, be gardening, hiking, walking a dog, playing golf and you could walk into this cloud and never know it. And you could get -- you know you're breathing straight from the you know, methane gas. So a lot of issues, a lot of health issues concerning this stuff.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): Well, thank you for coming in and testifying. Thank you for making the trip up from Sherman. And lastly, if we can help you obviously we will. But if you could maybe reach out to the Ag Center, that might be another venue that maybe we can get that across.

PAT BAILEY: You know what, I can't understand you.

REP. GUCKER (138TH): That's okay. Cindy's got it all. She's taking notes back there. Thank you for coming in.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Thank you, Representative. Did anybody else have any comments or questions? No? Okay. Thank you so much, Ms. Bailey. Moving on to SB 1063, which is AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO IMPROVE FARMLAND
AVAILABILITY FOR BEGINNING FARMERS. We have Jiff Martin. Okay. Chelsea Gazillo. Welcome. Thanks for being so patient.

CHELSEA GAZILLO: Thank you. Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco stepped out and honorable members of the Environment Committee, my name is Chelsea Gazillo. I'm the Working Lands Alliance Director. We are a broad-based, statewide coalition dedicated to preserving Connecticut’s farmland and keeping farmers on the land. I'm actually going to testify on behalf of a few Bills that we're both supporting and opposing during this hearing. I want to testify in support of both SB 1061 and SB 1063 and testify in opposition of HB 7545. Since it's inception the CIA has invested over $153 million into every community throughout the state. These investments have included everything from protecting prime farmland in small towns to improving city centers. This forward thinking legislation was structured to provide a dedicated funding source to worthwhile investments that improve our quality of life in Connecticut and we support restoring the $5 million diversion from the FY19 sweeps that will ensure the different sectors that CIA funds continue.

However, we oppose HB 7345 because this will -- this will threaten the integrity of CIA. While we appreciate and fully understand mitigating against the spread of invasive species we ask you to look at other funding sources like the boat sticker program that was proposed earlier this session in HB 6637 or municipalities could use HB 5254, which would be a voluntary program municipalities could administer to collect up to a 1 percent fee on real estate transactions to use on open --
space including mitigating against invasive species.

Finally we support the passage of the SB 1063. A 2016 report by American Farmland Trust called gaining insight, gaining access, cites that over the next 20 years 371 million acres of farmland or 41 percent of farmland in the US is expected to change hands. The average age of a farmer in Connecticut is 58 and according to the 2012 US Census, the average cost of farmland per acre in the state is over $11,000 which is nearly twice as much as the average cost of farmland per acre in New England. The state must address the high cost of farmlands and we ask that you pass this task force legislation so that we can begin to do so. Thank you. And I ask that you read my written testimony and also the written testimony of Susan Mitchell and Jiff Martin, who unfortunately wasn't able to be here today.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Ms. Gazillo. I know you and I have spoken about this initiative in the past and thank you for being here and providing your testimony. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you so much for coming.

CHELSEA GAZILLO: Thank you.


WILL O'MEARA: Good evening Madam Chair and members of the Environment Committee. My name is Will O'Meara. I am the Assistant Farm Manager of Waldingfield Farm in Washington, Connecticut. I'm also honored to serve as the Treasurer and a representative tonight of the New Connecticut Farmer
Alliance, Regional Chapter of the National Young Farmers Coalition. Like many of my young farmer peers, I came to farming not through a farming family, but through a passion for food, the environment and community. And after tirelessly pursuing the training and experience needed to be successful farmers, a generation of us are ready to steward Connecticut's farmland. I myself have been farming for about nine years now. But the rising cost of land in combination with student loan debt and the wages of the average farm manager has put our aspirations to own and operate our own farm businesses on hold. Connecticut can help ensure a bright future for agriculture in the state by working together with farmers and other stakeholders to propose creative and effective solutions to the challenge of land access. And that's exactly SB 1063 would do.

Over the last 40 years almost 50,000 acres of agricultural land will be new development in our state. As Chelsea mentioned the average price per acre for farmland here in Connecticut is just over 11,000, double what it is in the rest of the northeast.

The average age of the principal farm operator in Connecticut is 58 years old, on par with the national trend that sees over 57 percent of farmers nationwide at 55 or older and likely to retire within the next two decades. Despite these challenges Connecticut agriculture remains vital to our state economy generating more jobs per million dollar of sales than nearly any other sector in the state. And Connecticut as was mentioned a couple of hours by our friends from the Farm Bureau,
experienced the second largest increase of young farms in the nation between 2007 and 2012.

The reason I'm here tonight is because I believe in young farmers and I've invested what free time I have when I'm not on the farm into the New Connecticut Farmer Alliance because I'm hopeful for the future of agriculture in our state. That being said, I like many other young farmers are facing a difficult choice. I may be forced to look elsewhere in the northeast to start my own farm if I'm unable to affordable land in our state. This legislation would establish a diverse working coalition of farmers, advocates, legislators and state officials bringing together rural, suburban and urban voices. This task force and the report it would produce will give these issues the attention they deserve and make recommendations for specific policies that would support a vision for agriculture that is more equitable, more sustainable, more diverse and more successful. Thank you so much for taking the time to consider this important legislative proposal. With your support we know we can be successful. I'd be happy to take any questions at this time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. O'Meara. I know you and I have spoken also on this topic and I appreciate your testimony. Are there any comments from the Committee? Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Will for coming here and testifying and introducing yourself to me. And it's great to see young folks with plans on investing in state in Connecticut. We hear a lot of the counter to that opinion but in your estimation you said that you
like -- you may be forced to look somewhere else in the northeast, like where?

WILL OMEARA: Maine, Massachusetts, upstate New York, Vermont, New Hampshire. Unfortunately I've had many of my farming peers from this state looking elsewhere for farm jobs and opportunities to start their own farms in those states and other -- other places around the country.

REP. REYES (75TH): In your estimation, was a single -- what is a single thing that we can do as a state to encourage young entrepreneurs to stay here, especially in farming? The one single thing.

WILL OMEARA: The one single thing? I mean I would put it broadly and just say that we need to invest in our next generation of farmers to ensure that they'll be successful and agriculture in Connecticut doesn't look like any one thing. We're innovative. We farm in rural, suburban, urban areas. Some of us grow primarily indoors, some of us outdoors. So I just think that that investment -- those conversations need to happen in a place like this task force and figure out what those specific actions will look like.

REP. REYES (75TH): Well thank you for your resiliency and staying here as long as you have. I've seen here all day. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? No, thanks so much.

WILL OMEARA: Thanks so much.

JOEY LISTRO: Good evening members of the Environment Committee. My name is Joey Listro and I'm a former Chair of the New Connecticut Farmer Alliance and I'm also the Executive Director for New Britain Roots. We're a nonprofit urban agriculture organization in New Britain. I'm here today to express support for Senate Bill 1063, TO AUTHORIZE LAND ACCESS TASK FORCE. As a founding member of the New Connecticut Farmer Alliance I've had the privilege of working with dozens of young farmers in our state. I've seen how our organization has helped bring farmers together through the sharing of our common challenges and successes. All too often the most repeated challenge for many of our members has been access to affordable farmland. Our state is in a perfect position to examine the ways in which improving access to farmland can bolster the lives of farmers and the communities they farm in.

Our state has a renewed interest in farming marked by the 15 percent rise in young farmers under the age of 35 over the last decade. Keeping them in our state and ensuring their success in doing business here is the challenge we face today. We also have plenty of farmland and Department of Agriculture and land trusts have done a great job preserving it. The next steps are putting farmers on it.

The establishment of the Connecticut Land Access Task Force would be an important step in developing the policies and creating a system in which young farmers can become land stewards and operators of their own farm businesses. My own experience serves as an example of the journey a young farmer faces when just starting out. I started out as a farmer in Maine where I found a host of apprenticeship and training programs for new farmers and they helped me
developed the skills that I currently use today. In 2010 I chose to move back to my home state of Connecticut to continue working in agriculture. I landed at the Community Farm of Simsbury, which was home to the Incubator Farmer Program. This program was the only one like it in the state and it provided the support and technical training that I needed to launch my new farm enterprise. Incubator farmers were provided a three year lease on a parcel of farmland while participating in trainings that helped us set up our own business ventures. The new skills I learned in becoming a successful business owner paid off greatly, but the reality of many of the incubator farmers was that there was no pathway for them to transition to moving their newly-launched business to a more permanent state--place. Other challenges they face include running into issues around leases that are structured in a way that provide farmers with fewer rights and are too short for the farmer to make investments in their thriving business. My interest in urban agriculture has brought me to work at nonprofits on town-owned land but too often do towns not understand or are ill-equipped to create a productive relationship with farmers looking to farm on their property. The establishment of this task force and the subsequent passage of the legislation to implement the task force's recommendations would show a commitment to Connecticut's young and aspiring farmers that has been desperately needed over the last decade. With your support, we can be successful. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Listro for your testimony. Are there any comments or questions
from the Committee? No. Thank you so much.
Kieran Foran. Thanks for your patience. Welcome.

KIERAN FORAN: Thank you. Good evening members of the Environment Committee of the General Assembly. My name is Kieran Foran from Trifecta Eco Systems, an urban controlled environment company with, as far as I know the only commercial urban aquaponics farm in the state of Connecticut. In the interest of brevity I'll kind of keep it short and not repeat anything that's already been said. I definitely support the statements that have been made already in terms of need for this task force to help with land transition for aging farmers. I just ask that the Committee make a couple more considerations when they think about should this task force get approved, appointing members to the task force, particularly in the area of farmers. I think we need farmers that have a diverse array of experience that isn't limited to just soil farmers and helping them out, but also new modern production methods that include being able to farm in indoor environments, on rooftop environments. I think Connecticut has a unique opportunity with all the vacant sort of mills and factories and partially vacant mills and factories, that we can use these as opportunities for this task force to go out and find land for new farmers and maybe even attract farmers from out of state to these places because they're cheaper unique rent opportunities.

In addition, indoor farms in the northeast have increased over 30 percent in 2017 so there's definitely a growing trend for this type of farming in this area and it would be great for Connecticut to sort of take charge on that lead and sort of help farmers who are interested in this, you know find --
find places where they can grow food. We also see urban farms as a way for the state to become a little more food solvent and especially with indoor farming, we have the capability of producing 365 days a year without uninterrupted production so it would be great to sort of support farmers who are looking to kind of do that.

I'll conclude with saying that we ask the Environment Committee to support proposed Bill 1063 to authorize a land task force, one that can support a vision for agriculture in the state that is more diversified, more sustainable, supports new farmers and gives them the footing they need to be successful.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Foran --

KIERAN FORAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): For your testimony. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Representative Gresko. It's been a long day. (Laughing) Did you have a question?

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Where is your farm?

KIERAN FORAN: So our current facility is in Meriden, Connecticut and then we just put a lease on the old Urban Oaks property in New Britain, Connecticut so we'll be expanding there with greenhouse production and field agriculture as well.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? No. Thank you so much, Mr. Foran.

KIERAN FORAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Up next is HB 5395, which is AN ACT REQUIRING AN EVALUATION OF THE STATE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE LAW. And I have Steve Schrag up first. No? All right. John Murray? Okay. Lynne Bonnett? Welcome. Thank you for your patience.

LYNNE BONNETT: Yeah. So my name is Lynne Bonnett. I live in New Haven. I used to be Chair of the New Haven Environmental Justice Network and I'm speaking today about the environmental justice law from the perspective of my experience in that role.

So I support the changes that are being made. I mean there are definite problems with notification, signage. The cases that I was involved in, the entities were on dead-end streets so who's going to see that sign? It's just not an effective way to let the public know that the polluting facility only had to notify property abutters by mail, so in my role as a volunteer with Environmental Justice was -- meant that I went door to door. I made a flyer. I went to people and explained, you know there's going to be an informational session and might be a reason why -- you know, you might want to attend, on my own time and on my own dime. So I think that notification is still a problem. My suggestion would be that you send through mail a postcard to a resident a mile radius from the proposed facility in a way to ensure that people that live around the facility that might be effected at least get something in their mailbox about it.
And the next point about meaningful participation. So my experience is that some entities say, well we had our informational sessions, that's it. That's your seat at the table. We don't have to do anything more. And that's because the law says may or -- it says may not shall. So a savvy attorney advising their client will say, hey you don't have to do anything more than the informational session and you'll fulfill the law. So if you're a citizen, organization asking for a seat at the table it gets tough when you're up against an entity that approaches it in the spirit of environmental justice law in that manner.

And then third thing I wanted to say was that Connecticut concentrates polluting facilities in certain communities and it's been that way since I've lived here in 1990. When the law is applied to a new entity or revision of an entity they consider it isolation and as long as that entity may -- fulfills the regulations that are current for that particular type of facility, so if it's a waste station or a power plant, they all have certain criteria, right? And so when they consider things in isolation what happens is what the Senator from Waterbury said, was that certain communities get a lot of them and they can't say no to more of them because as long as that entity meets the regulations then they're approved.

There's no consideration to what a community currently suffers. So in that spirit -- I know I'm out of town but in the spirit of metrics, we have a wonderful department of public health. We know that citizens that live near these facilities are more sick than others so why is the public health part of the permit process, and why isn't information about
the incidents of chronic disease we know are related to pollution, heart disease, respiratory illness, diabetes II, why are these part of the permit process? And if a community has a high incidence of chronic illness that we know are related to pollution why isn't that considered as a reason to not permit additional polluting facilities to exist? So I'm out of time, but I also wanted to say something about storm water 'cause I was involved with that too but I'm out of time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): I appreciate that Ms. Bonnett. Are there any questions or comments? Do you just want to let us know what -- are you supportive of the storm water bill?

LYNNE BONNETT: Well it's asking for suggestions so I have some suggestions. In New Haven we have -- the Sewer Authority, we have regional authority that's the drinking water and we have the City of New Haven. They're all involved with water quality but they have separate jurisdiction and so as someone in the bioregional group that wants to help water quality issues, combine sewer overflows, we have the sewer plant saying no we don't do storm water because we just do stuff underground. We have the City of New Haven saying, no we can't work with residents because we don't have the money and we have the Regional Water Authority saying, well we think it's important. Yes, we worked with the residents around issues of storm water runoff when it affected our drinking water supply at Lake Whitney. So we have all these different entities that are involved with water quality but none of them work with the public. The public is low hanging fruit that's left out of the discussion because nobody wants to invest in it because they
don't have to. So one of the things we wanted to do was, okay why don't all of these entities contribute some money to create one position, a public liaison to help residents learn about disconnecting their downspouts or learn about storm water runoff. The sewer plant has combined sewer area. So storm water runoff and combined sewer definitely affects how much raw sewage comes out because it's coming out from the storm water getting in the same pipe. So for them to say, no this isn't our responsibility is not accurate. It is in certain areas. So that's all I was going to say.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Are there questions or comments? Yes, Representative Reyes.

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you very much for your testimony and thank you for referencing Senator Joe Hartley's comments earlier this morning. And I represent that area that's marginalized community that has been in my estimation, over saturated with enough pollutants to the point where the numbers clearly show that it's affecting public health. And we did attack this from the public health standpoint and really got nowhere. And it is -- that's the reason why I believe that we need to put a strong EJL if you will, a stronger Environmental Justice Law with a lot more metrics to be met and a lot -- something stronger than what we have because right now it is nothing more than notification. And we need -- if we're going to make Connecticut a better place we have to do better with the Environmental Justice Law so thank you for your testimony here tonight. There's no question that we can do a lot better. Thank you, Madam Chair.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Yes, Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for testifying tonight. I was just going to point out in the DEEP side, I believe in the DEEP's statutes or their policies, in any case they have something about best management practices, storm water best management practices. So I would suggest that maybe start looking into that. I guess that your storm water system and your sewage system are separated, correct?

LYNNE BONNETT: No, they're -- yeah, some of it.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): No, they're together. Some of it. Okay. I know in Stanford they were separated but that's a different story for Stanford. So I would suggest look into the policies regarding best management practices and if you cannot maybe get help from the DEEP to maybe enforce those policies so that pollutants are more restricted in the area. I'm not familiar with the area unfortunately so I wish I did know more.

LYNNE BONNETT: The problem is we don't have -- it's not that we don't have information, it's not always working with the public. So who's going to go door -- you know, who's going to work with the public explaining why it's important and encouraging them to you know, obey the ordinance?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Right. Well in Stanford what we did at some point because some things were not respected in regards to storm water directly, organizing -- I'm not saying that it's our job to clean up, but we're going to you know documented them and then we submitted this documentation to the
City, which then became the DEEP and then I eventually had to go to the EPA so that I got more help from the DEEP, but you know these are just food for thought.

LYNNE BONNETT: You mean you reported public to the City? Did they get fined and stuff?

REP. MICHEL (146TH): There was some -- something happened for sure in the City of Stanford. It's just a suggestion. I mean I'll talk with Representative Reyes since he -- if I can help more with suggestions. Thank you for testifying.

LYNNE BONNETT: You're welcome.


DIANE LAURICELLA: Good evening.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Good evening.

DIANE LAURICELLA: I tried to find some food to eat to sustain me through the wait and I feel sorry for all of you because there's not much in your vending machines that's healthy. May want to check on that. Thank you Honorable Chairpersons, Senator Cohen and Representative Demicco for the opportunity to speak. I thank Representative Reyes, Butler, Simms and Senator Hartley for bringing this Bill to your attention. My name is Diane Lauricella and I'm here to support House Bill 5395 with the inclusion of at least some of the following suggestions. As a former hazardous waste investigator with the DEEP, which at the time was the DEP in the 1980s I was -- I'm aware of many historic sites that are still
there and still in cleanup and are still right next door to many of the same people that we intend to help with the Environmental Justice Policies and Bill.

I'm here as a member of and pro bono Environmental Advisor to the South Norwalk Citizens for Justice. President and Councilman, Ernie Dumas could not be here because he was working full-time. I should be. And a wonderful group of citizens including many who are low and middle income, homeless and people of color. Norwalk is a listed Environmental Justice community which may be of surprise to many of you. Stanford used to be. It had many manufacturing. Norwalk manufacturing days are diminished but still has sites and also needed. I've also done some work in Bridgeport as far as Environmental Justice work.

The current EJ law just does not fulfill its intended purpose at times. Some of the premises upon which it is set includes when these -- there were -- this was done before many of these facilities and manufacturers were put in place way before the environmental laws. While I stand ready and able to assist the sponsors and legislature in improving the outcomes of this Bill and the environmental statute I ask that you consider the following, at least some of the following suggestions.

Number one, please change all language that says may to shall throughout. Number two, there needs to be a serious review of the staffing for DEEP and the Department of Health. All right, that went fast. I'll wrap up. There are different sections and here's the main one I'd like to see you change. Under affecting facilities, Section 1-A2. This
statute has to heavily weighed on waste facilities not on storage materials and things that create noise standards. These are serious health issues that affect people of color, low and middle income. I ask that you add or consider adding to this legislation, 'cause I don't want to throw out the whole baby with the bath water, add contractor yards. Add demolition projects, even though they're temporary often times they last for months. Construction projects, which include sand piles. Sand used in construction and cement plants contain silica and silica is a human carcinogen. We've had many circumstances where citizens of color, poor citizens and homeless -- I'm sorry, public housing has been right next door with -- to uncovered sand piles and I believe the time has come to put this under an Environmental Justice umbrella. I also suggest you add cement plants, possibly legacy contaminated sites that the DEEP has a list of, many of which have not been cleaned up or assessed. Dumpster storage facilities and lastly diesel bus and school bus facilities because diesel fumes create asthma triggers and are often sited in the same areas where we plan to help people of color.

I also just wanted people that -- the aim of the Environmental Justice, which is not just people of color. It's also low and middle income people. I agree with Ms. Bonnett's testimony. Meaning and public participation must include, not may, but must include -- I ask that you designate and make sure that you designate local government liaison like the Health Director, because I have witnessed where the applicant follows the letter of the watered down law but no one knows about the application because of the way it's written. It took five years to get the
current law under way. It needs updating. We have to be reasonable but I ask that you consider my suggestions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much for your testimony. Are there questions? Yes, Representative Simms.

REP. SIMMS (140TH): Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you Ms. Lauricella for your testimony today. Thank you for being patient and waiting all day. I know you've been here pretty much all day and waited for a long time. First I'd like to just thank you again for standing up for my constituents in South Norwalk. I know you live in Norwalk but you're not a -- you don't live in that district, but you are an advocate for Environment Justice issues. Also could you -- could you share some of your experience related to Environment Justice law including a recent matter at the Nathaniel Ealy site in my district?

DIANE LAURICELLA: Yes. Thank you, Representative Simms. What I do as an Environmental Consultant I always try to teach the public, and citizens, and businesses how to make their government laws work better for them to solve problems and to move forward. And there was a specific case with -- in your district where the Board of Ed and the City are beginning to clear land for a new school, or a school for -- a community school. And because that is not listed, there were huge piles of sand that were brought in and also a lot of rock drilling and rock breaking up of rocks and piles. There were odors and there was noise, but mainly the sand, the silica dust from the sand piles were uncovered. Because that particular activity is not listed as an
affecting facility according to the current law it gave much, much less -- it was much harder to line up and to ask for the Health Director.

I was able to get the neighbors and council people to ask the Health Director to weigh in, and the zoning people. But the thing is, it should be an automatic thing before anyone even thinks of putting sand out there. It's also abutting a public housing facility and a school for young children whose lungs are not yet formed. I was shocked that Best Management Practices for sand piles should be allowing for covers and this Committee would do a great service to all folks in the Environmental Justice communities if they would just make sure that all sand piles and anything where you could have a dust issue are covered. So in that case, I do believe -- a lot of people have said to me, because it's a temporary situation we don't want to have to be a little bit more responsible to reach out to the public and it's just temporary. Well not quite because those piles of sand are going to be there for at least a year and why should they be allowed to continue contaminating the area -- the area quality as well as other dangers?

There was another case in Bridgeport. I used to be a member of the Connecticut Council on Environmental Justice and CV Avenue, O&G had pile -- huge piles of sand right near a group of people's residences and small businesses and for years and years there was nothing done. Now some of this has to do with the local officials as well. It’s not just a state issue. But the thing is there has to be accountability at every level of government when it comes to, in my opinion, when it comes to control and assessment of toxins. Once we know what we
have, where it is, I think then we could prioritize which ones need a cover over of plastic over a sand pile and which ones may need air monitoring. Which ones may need to be cleaned up.

And I think -- I worked at the DEP in the 80s. I was much younger then but even then we were the poor stepchild to the DOT and some other departments. I really want to tell you that a lot of communities, especially environmental communities are being hurt by not having enough properly trained DEP people to come down and look at some of the air quality and the other problems. I lastly just wanted to say in the case of the -- Nathaniel Ealy School in South Norwalk and other sites, expanding it to much more than a half mile to engage the applicant must happen. I don't know if the magic number is one mile or maybe two miles, but I do know one half a mile did not embrace neighbors that lived across a small harbor inlet when we had a lot of problems on a major industrial area that's still left in Norwalk. And so there are things that you can ask the DEP as far as the metrics, and I do agree with all the speakers that say we need some metrics, but I want to just say that also in the case of Norwalk that on line 112 it states that the community -- the community environmental benefit agreement would only be -- must be done if you have five or more facilities. Well in Norwalk a lot of the facilities that we have gone out of business and moved elsewhere because there is the influence of Sanford whose trying to become less than a manufacturing place. So I think that number should be reduced to a 2 or 33. Most towns and cities have a sewage treatment plant, gave a solid waste transfer station. But in Norwalk we wouldn’t fall under this
particular line and I don't know why they chose 5. I know Waterbury and Hartford have a lot more facilities that are regulated, however, in Norwalk we have other types of facilities and should any of you decide to add some of the affected facilities I suggested then we would be allowed to have these community agreements.

REP. SIMMS (140TH): Thank you for that testimony. Also, going back to that Nathaniel Ealy site, do you know whether or not the developers had permission to actually start construction on that site and if that site is under any kind of restrictive convenient or not?

DIANE LAURICELLA: It's my understanding that that site is currently under study and because it was a community park as you know and a lot of it has been already clear-cut. Some of it has to do with the way the state education department has people apply in advance for state aid. But I think what happened on that site is something that I was very surprised occurred because much of the woodlands has been removed and in its place are these piles of sand. So I would love to see some accountability and citation of the contractors that were hired to do that kind of work. But also, the entities that allowed it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Representative could you just turn on your microphone?

REP. SIMMS (140TH): Thank you. I always miss that point. And can you tell me why should there be some addition to the affecting facility list?

DIANE LAURICELLA: What occurred back I think around -- well it took five years to get the EJ Bill we
have. There was a lot of give and take. In those days it was not as popular but what we are finding, especially with the potential for extreme weather, is going to affect a lot of urban communities and Environmental Justice communities like Norwalk, like Bridgeport on the coast, and then on rivers. And some of these affected or just listed as affecting facilities were on the original request but in order to pass it there was a lot of horse trading going on. In places like Norwalk it is the contractor yard that is much more predominant than an ash plant. In fact there are no land -- new landfills being placed in Connecticut because we fill them all up, most of them. So we need to modernize the list to include things that are currently necessary for the functioning of our businesses but are also -- like a place like Norwalk there's a lot of new growth and construction going on and I do believe, because it's happening often in environmental communities, Environment Justice communities, there's no real protections that cause that applicant to have to talk to the public about the toxins and the noise and the dust. There are -- there are laws, state, local, there are some laws that you would think would have handled it, but apparently it's not working because a lot of us have to spend hours and hours of our own time like Ms. Bonnett said, trying to tell the public that there's -- they have rights and that a hearing is going on.

REP. SIMMS (140TH): Thank you for that testimony, Ms. Lauricella, and thank you Madam Chair as well. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Representative Reyes.
REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you very much for staying here with us as late as you did. It's interesting that you commented on line 112 that the -- the five or more permit effected facilities was high. We actually again, coming from a heavily industrial section of the city and I think you were here when I actually said I believe we have over 20 in that area. And basically what we're saying, hey when is enough is enough? And we -- there is no saturation point and that's what's missing in the EJL law. And I think that you bring an interesting point here and I would love to support too, but that would go back to us pushing against municipalities, shunning away taxpayers to there has to be a healthy balance here.

DIANE LAURICELLA: Thank you. I just wanted to say that when a community has areas that have management, proper management it actually increases the economic development potential of those urban areas. So it should not be seen as something that will cause potential developers to run away. That's why I thought -- I don't know what the magic number is. Definitely at least five, but I don't know if a city like Norwalk that's changing would then fall into the need for that community environmental agreement and I'd hate to see them lose out on what could be a wonderful time of people connecting and talking. I'm one that likes to also work with the regulated community to encourage them to do better as a way to market their facilities as well.

REP. REYES (75TH): Well thank you very much for that response. And Madam Chair, if I may just have one last question here. The -- what I have noticed from the Environmental Justice law as it's written
today without any changes from this Committee is that there are not enough folks actually to enforce it and actually communicate what's going on. So what we're doing is trying to add a little bit more -- more teeth to it but they really do lack enforcers and they absolutely do not do the best job communicating so I think yourself and Ms. Bonnett were spot on on that.

DIANE LAURICELLA: Yes. One other form of communication if I might, on line 87 I forgot to mention it actually talked about circulation, what the applicant has -- where and when they have to file, if they're in an effecting facility. I think that needs to be updated as well. And also line 85, instead of just having newspapers it should include social media. Now many folks don't have social media so it covers it but many do now. Circulation is greater on Thursdays and Sundays for everybody so why initially so many years ago they said Mondays is beyond me. But I did note a lot of people never knew there was a meeting because it was in Monday's paper that hardly anyone would read. So that's why it needs updating and refreshing and I'm so happy this Committee has taken it upon themselves to look at it.

REP. REYES (75TH): Well that -- those are two excellent points and I thank you very much for testifying here tonight. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Simms did you have something to add?

REP. SIMMS (140TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes and to Representative Reyes' remarks regarding his EJ Bill, I actually proposed a Bill 6257 that I think would answer or address a lot of the concerns
and questions on both sides here. So if -- I would love to be working -- love to work with the Committee and Representative Reyes with -- on the language that would include some of -- of my language of the 6257 Bill to kind of strengthen it and give it some -- a little more teeth. So again, thank you, Madam Chair for allowing me to testify here.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions, comments? Okay. Thank you so much for your testimony. Kevin Zak. Is Kevin here? Alex Rodriguez? Not to be confused with A-Rod. (Laughing) Welcome. Do you get that all the time?

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: I do, I do get that all the time.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. (Laughing)

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Thank you Honored Chairs, Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco, distinguished members of the Environment Committee. Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of House Bill 5395, AN ACT REQUIRING AN EVALUATION OF THE STATE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE LAW.

For a long time Connecticut has been known as a nationwide leader in the fight against climate change, however our state has not done enough to address environmental injustice concerns. Low-income black and Latino communities in Hartford, Waterbury, New Haven, and Bridgeport are disproportionately impacted by climate change, pollution, and other environmental threats. I come to you today as a community organizer and concerned neighbor for communities that I have taken part in advocating for. In the past year my Connecticut team has joined South End residents in the South End
of Waterbury against the expansion of the F&G facility. F&G has been known as a terrible neighbor to its residents and these communities have faced so many significant pollution threats over the years. Because of the expansion of the facility there is now 100 plus diesel powered trucks coming in and out of the South End leaving the communities very -- very vulnerable to high bouts of smog emitted from the trucks and though -- And another example of an environmental injustice currently happening in Connecticut is the -- in Hartford -- Hartford is home to an aging, high-polluting trash incinerator that the state would like to get rid of, however, this trash incinerator serves 50 plus municipalities and so getting rid -- getting rid of this isn't so easy. But all of the proposals that have been brought up to the City of Hartford have required more incinerating of trash and again adding to the threat of mercury poisoning and other threats leaving these communities very vulnerable.

So to sum it up, I'm in support of this Bill because I think -- I think the state hasn't done enough to address environmental injustices and I think there should be -- I think that we should come up with more -- more ways to combat such as more investment in waste -- waste removal, recycling and composting services because this isn't sustainable at the rate we're going. The more burning of trash that goes on in Connecticut the more that these predominantly low income and black and Hispanic communities are exposed to this waste, it puts us at a disadvantage and we're not asked smoking or nonsmoking in our daily lives, so I think that's immensely unfair. And so I urge all of the Committee members to support this Bill and co-sponsor it because
environmental justice is pivotal to fighting climate change.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much, Mr. Rodriguez. A question from Representative Palm.

REP. PALM (36TH): Hi Alex. Thank you for being here. About six or seven years ago I moved my family from Hartford where we lived to along the Connecticut River and I still feel very concerned about what I saw when I was a resident of Hartford. So thank you for your testimony. I feel like I have one foot in both of these -- in each of those two worlds. Without putting you on the spot, do you have -- because you're a very articulate advocate for this, do you have any words of wisdom about how those of us who represent rural, unpolluted areas, how can we make our constituents more aware of the phenomenon that you're referring to, which is also international. You know the people who are least responsible for international kind of crisis are you know, the geographical south, are the ones who are most baring the burden. Do you have any perspective on how we can make a broader awareness about this issue?

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: My perspective, I would say involves supporting green infrastructure projects, supporting green initiatives such as the Green New Deal, such as Community Solar, such as any -- any project that is -- that invests in the future of Connecticut. But in another standpoint I think -- I think transportation is something that needs to be discussed a little more. The electrification of transportation to be specific. Multi-model -- multi-modal transportation is very important. Hartford's -- we're exposed to so much diesel
exhaust on a regular basis, people commuting from all across the state to their Monday through Friday jobs, 9 to 5 and it leaves these communities very vulnerable again to these harmful pollutants. Car pooling is one example. Investing in energy efficiency and clean energy programs is another big concern of mine because we have to make sure that we get the most out of what we have and the best energy you use -- the best energy used is the best energy you don't use. And so supporting green initiatives is my best solution to this topic, but again touching on the waste problem, more composting and recycling services, investment in that within each municipality is pivotal to the future of Connecticut.

REP. PALM (36TH): Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for testifying tonight. Yep, tonight. I just want -- (laughing) I just wanted to ask about -- because I'm not that familiar with F&G but when you mentioned burning. The burn on this -- on the same facility where they do their -- the garbage transfer operation?

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Oh the -- well F&G is the garbage facility in Waterbury that has increased their truck hauling operations. In Hartford we have a proposal from Accessor Rooney on the table to burn more trash and from what I understand in the past year one of the incinerators broke and the state had to -- the state had to continue -- the state had to ship off trash to St. Vincent's County Maryland, which is again a big environmental injustice issue. I have
colleagues in Maryland that are on the ground working with black and Latino families, working to mold the next group of environmentalists to take on the concerns that many of these communities have at a local level, and also bring it to the state level. So again, I must reiterate, recycling and composting is pivotal to the future of the state and I applaud the Committee for the actions taken earlier in the day around the plastic straw band -- plastic straw band and the Styrofoam band. I was very delighted.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Is the DEEP's quality management team involved in this? Have they tested the air for quality or things of that sort? Any reports that you know of?

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Not as far as I know. When F&G applied and tracing to Waterbury, when F&G applied to expand their facility they were originally denied back in 2017, however, this past year in 2018, they were threatening to sue the City and unfortunately the Mayor folded and allowed this injustice to happen. Hartford is -- Hartford is another example entirely. I feel like they are going to go through with Assessor Rooney proposal and it's very concerning because burning trash isn't sustainable but neither is letting it stockpile. I'm more than open to any conversation around sustainability and carbon reduction specifically in these low-income communities moving forward.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): And one last question or more of a comment. I think community -- at this level I think enforcement would be called for.

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Yes, absolutely. Yeah, I think there -- I think -- I'd like to echo all the comments made by Ms. Lauricella before me because
she's very knowledgeable in this regard. All the 
mays in the Environmental Justice Bill that already 
exist should be changed to shalls because this state 
needs to take more positive action regarding these 
communities situated nearby these toxic 
incinerators, high bouts of traffic, and other -- 
other high-risk phenomenon.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Anybody that you know of got 
sick -- yeah I thought it was my last question, 
sorry about that Mr. Chair.

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Well in -- in the past I have 
trained environment promoters, I've trained over 20 
of them so far. A majority of the environmental 
promoters that I've trained do have asthma. It may 
be traced to the high bouts of traffic that exist in 
Hartford and Waterbury. The promoters I've trained 
have been from these areas. I haven't -- I haven't 
yet expanded into Bridgeport or New Haven, but I 
would like to do so because I think it's so 
important to equip new leaders with knowledge about 
climate change and how to overcome it and eventually 
have a seat where you are sitting and make more 
positive change.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Well I encourage you to run. 
It's always good to have many candidates in 
elections and primaries all over the place. There's 
nothing better than that. So I encourage you to 
continue with your train of thought. Thank you. 
Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. 
Representative Reyes. Did you have a question?

REP. REYES (75TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just -- 
Mr. Rodriguez, thank you very much for hanging in
there. I know you've been here all day. A couple of days ago I was handed this report, this NPR report which the study finds racial gap between who causes the air pollution and who breathes it and it was an NPR report basically stating pretty much what you were saying about scientists and policymakers have long known that black and Hispanic Americans tend to live in neighborhoods that have more pollutions of all kinds than white Americans. And because pollution exposures can range health problems this inequity could be a driver for unequal health outcomes across the US. And this is what you were talking about. The marginalized communities continue to get more and more of the pollutants. And I would encourage everybody, I'm going to leave this with the desk, I would encourage everybody to take this. It's an easy quick read but it talks to exactly the disparity that you're talking about. And I thank you for your advocacy.

ALEX RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Representative Reyes. And if I may, in the past year I was involved with many groups in advocating for the increasing of the renewable energy portfolio to 40 percent by 2030 as well as the Greenhouse Gas Reduction by 45 percent by 2030 to meet the long-term Greenhouse Gas Reduction targets. And then this past Friday I mobilized youth to hold a climate strike right outside the state capital. Youth are concerned. Youth are in the fight of their lives. I'm in the fight of my life and I -- I fear for the day that I have a child or a grandchild and they ask me, why didn't you take more action? Why -- why am I suffering to breathe? Why am I -- why do I have a gas mask every time I go outside? This is -- this is the fight of a lifetime and I thank you all for
hearing me today. And I urge you to support this Bill.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, sir. Thank you for your articulate testimony. Does anybody else have questions? No? Okay. All set. Thank you very much. So we have one more person to testify on House Bill 5395 and that would be Sophia Webber. Is Sophia here? Sophia is not here, okay. If she comes in we'll -- we'll certainly go back to her. So we move on to House -- Senate Bill 1061. The first person is Rob Lafrance to be followed by Amy Patterson. Welcome. Thank you for your patience.

ROBERT LAFRANCE: Good evening Chairs Cohen and Demicco, Ranking Members Miner and Harting and Vice-Chairs Kushner and Gresko. My name is Robert LaFrance and for folks who don't know me, I used to be the Legislative Liaison for DEP for a long time and recently I was fortunate enough to be able to retire from state service and take a job as the Director of Policy for the National Audubon Society's State Affiliate Office called Audubon Connecticut. I'm here tonight to basically testify in favor of two Bills and in opposition to one other. I'd like to basic -- I'd like to support Senate Bill 1061, which is the Bill to restore the funds to the Community Investment Act. I'd also like to testify in favor of Senate Bill 1062. I think you heard some testimony earlier this evening -- I guess it was earlier like at lunchtime today from folks from Stamford who came in here and started to talk about the reserve funds for climate change and coastal resiliency and I provided written testimony for the folks here as well. And finally I want to voice my strong opposition to Senate Bill 7347, which is a proposal to exempt seniors and
Veterans from the passport to state parks, and I'll talk about each of these quickly.

First and foremost we -- the Bill I want to talk out of the gate on was the Community Investment Act. When I worked at the department we relied on these funds for a lot of -- a lot of purchases of property for the municipal grant programs that we would do to be able to purchase open space. It also supports agricultural sustainability and other agricultural programs as well as historic preservation and affordable housing. And it's important because it's a balanced approach. It's a balanced approach of being able to put things together.

At my new -- in my new role at National Audubon Society we like it because it helps us do part of our mission, which is to protect habitat for birds. So we'd like to see it stay. We'd like to see the $5 million sweep that came last time, came out of the budget for 2019, put back. And like to make certain that we continue to make certain that the Community Investment Act continues to do the important work it does and continues its funding, and I know folks are familiar with that.

The second thing I want to talk about in favor of is this new authorization concerning -- oops. I've got to learn to talk faster, so. I used to be better at that. Anyway sustain -- I think this resiliency concept is a really good one. I just want to say that quickly. I think there's some really good concepts behind it. I'll just put in a plug for CIRCA. I think there's a lot of good work that they've done. And also put in a good word for Senator -- excuse me, Representative Bocuse. I studied an article in my testimony. She had done
some really good work up in Plainville section actually taking some money aside and using it for protection. Anyway, you can take a look at my testimony on that. And finally, I think most importantly from where I sit, the passport to parks is a fantastic bipartisan fund that we set up to protect the state parks. Birders use them throughout this state and are very, I think very happy that they're able to continue to do that. We've finally established a long-term sustainable methodology for taking care of the parks. Any time you start to look at reductions to the revenues coming in, it's going to impact the department's ability to keep up these, I would describes gems of this state. And I'm hopeful that we're going to continue to take care of them and improve them and let our kids go out and look at birds and do the other things that they like to do in the wilds that we call our state parks. So thank you for that. I'm happy to answer questions.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you. Thank you for that testimony. Does anybody have any questions for Mr. LaFrance? I have a question actually. Since I know you're familiar with this. I assume you're familiar with this based on your career. So the Community Investment Act.

ROBERT LAFRANCE: Yes.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): It has been suggested and advocated for you know the last couple of years that we should use part of that funding, the Community Investment Act funding for invasive species eradication in lakes and rivers in the state of Connecticut. I was just wondering; would you care
to weigh in on that or would you just assume leave it alone?

ROBERT LAFRANCE: So I know other folks behind me will weigh in on that from various perspectives. We've talked about this. I know that there was another Bill that was put forward that looked at this in a slightly different way, looking at it as a sort of separate funding source to try to take a look at this. We believe invasives are a problem and I think we heard a lot of issues about invasives across the board. I think it's great that we're starting to take a look at the aquatic invasive issue. Paying for it the way that they -- we've been talking about paying for it through some kind of a stamp or stamp program seems to make sense. Again I think the details are going to have to be worked out in terms of how you actually would collect that and move forward with that. But I think others will tell you that the notion of trying to expand an already expanded, a fairly large pie of uses from the Community Investment Act, maybe there's a better way. And I think that -- the fact that another Bill came up to look at it that way, maybe that's the better view.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you.

ROBERT LAFRANCE: Thank you. Thanks a lot.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Anybody else? So we're all set? Okay. Thank you very much. So Amy Paterson to be followed by I don't know. I'll let you know in a minute. Oh actually, I think the next person on deck is Bill Lucey. So Amy, please.

AMY PATERSON: Thank you. For the record, I'm Amy Blaymore Paterson. I'm the Executive Director of
the Connecticut Land Conservation Council, which is the statewide umbrella organization for Connecticut Planned Conservation Community including its 137 or so land trusts. Thank you for giving me this opportunity tonight to present testimony. I did submit written testimony on five different Bills. I will limit my oral testimony tonight on the two Bills related to the Community Investment Act. SB 1061, we strongly support the restoration of the Community Investment Act funds. As previous speakers have eluded to, this fund has exceeded all expectations. It's not just working; it's excelling and so that is in both form and function.

The continuous diversion from the cuts have forced the agencies from all four sectors, five including Dairy Support, to restrict the timing and the volume of the projects, it's been very disruptive, particularly for the land use projects. So for the open space sector, in other ward for DEEP as our agency, the Community Investment Act is the only consistent source of funding for the open space and Watershed Land Acquisition Grant Program for towns, for land trusts and water companies to purchase land. It's the only source of funding for the Urban Green and Community Garden Program for distressed and targeted communities, and it also funds several staff positions.

To give you an example of its import, the 2018 and 2019 grants that were just submitted back in February the value of those projects was about $23 million. These are open space projects. The awards would be, if all of those were approved, in the $14-16 million range and DEEP does not have the funding for that award if it was going to do a full award. And so the restoration of the funds from the
previous cuts would go a long way to helping this current grant ground for which all of these communities are waiting to hear about, as well as the program in the long run.

For HB 7335, which is the Bill that you just questioned Rob LaFrance about, Representative Demicco, we would oppose using the Community Investment Act funds for an invasive, aquatic invasive program. Those funds would come out of DEEP's 25 percent portion and as I already suggested that that fund is already stretched thin. And so we of course believe that addressing aquatic as well as terrestrial invasive species is of critical import to the state right now and we have suggested -- we have suggested that there be other sources of funding to be looked at in order to do that. It is a priority for all land conservation organizations right now.

The two Bills that you have before you now, one being 6637, which would be the Invasive Stamp Program, as well as 5254, which would enable towns to adopt a program if they so choose to using a buyer's conveyance fee to address both acquisition as well as stewardship of land and that stewardship would of course include invasive species management. And so those are two Bills that are before this Committee that we feel would do an excellent job of -- especially as a first step in addressing invasive species without having to further impair the integrity of the Community Investment Act. Thank you.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Amy. I appreciate that. Something told me that we were going to get a
question from Representative Harding and Representative, please feel free.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hi Amy. How are you?

AMY PATERSON: Very well, thank you.

REP. HARDING (107TH): I want to thank you for coming up and for being such a strong advocate for the Community Investment Act and land preservation throughout the state, which is something that's critical. My -- my frustration and I think we have shared this together, is preservation of our lakes currently is at an impasse. If you -- if you go particularly where I am, where Julie is in the state, where Kent is in the state, where Craig represents, with the massive influx in invasive species whether it be milfoil, whether it be zebra mussels, whether it be -- whatever it may be that's invading our lakes and our bodies of water. We're at an impasse, and the preservation of these lakes are at a critical point. And I would argue that they are as important as almost every single preservation initiative we may have. And so if there isn't a piece of the pie to share so-to-say for that initiative, why do we have initiatives for preservation? If this is not as important as any other initiative? I guess I'll leave the question at that.

AMY PATERSON: Yeah, and we have -- and we have had this conversation many times over the years and I don't think we disagree in the -- in the sense that this is a critical problem. You've heard testimony from many people tonight talking about how -- and this was related to the pesticides Bill, how critical it is to address the invasive species
issue. However, the Community Investment Act is a limited source of funding. It is already stretched thin and you know, we are not at all meeting our land conservation goals as it is. So why rob Peter to pay Paul. Why don't we look at other funding mechanisms to address this very serious problem that we can all agree upon. And so I don't think that -- and I think I speak for the Land Conservation community to say, that taking money from a program that is working, working well and is still struggling because of previous years of diversions and cuts; take that money, dilute the program so that it's not working nearly as well and then take a -- take a small portion of that to address a very, very large problem that really does need a significant look to see how we can most comprehensively address invasives not only in the water but on land. And I think the other -- the other issue might be as well that we're talking about a very -- we're talking about one stakeholder in a very large problem. The Lake -- Lake Authorities of course need assistance but so do the municipalities and so do the nonprofits that are investing in these properties to purchase them for future generations. So I don't think we disagree at all on the nature and extent on this problem. Clearly we disagree on the use of the funds for that problem but the offer stands as I've made every single year that we would love to work with you on looking at different solutions. And one that we had suggested was the -- the stamp, and I feel that that is a Bill that is before you and should be given an opportunity to move forward so that you can try that program as a solution rather than dismissing two options, including 5254 that could work and focus on a fund that's already working for the purposes that
it was set up to address. Again, I don't -- I don't think we disagree at all in that way.

REP. HARDING (107TH): If I may through you? Thank you. I agree, we're very much on the same page. My argument though is that we have a solution. That's one solution. It is not going to resolve the problem. If we believe that only one solution is going to resolve this huge problem that we have, we're foolish to think that. And so I just think that we have to have a discussion about also utilizing existing funds some, not a lot, in a manner which could help preserve these waterways. And I'm not just saying that just Lake Authorities deserve this funding. I agree with you. It's municipalities. I mean I would be open to opening it up to all waterways, whether it be rivers throughout the state, whether it preservation efforts with the Sound. And obviously I particularly care about the lakes because of my district, but I think all waterways are dealing with this issue. And my argument has been that we have found crises or issues where we've opened up the Community Investment Act in the past. And how this is not as important as initiative currently that we can't have another discussion again about possibly opening up this Act to address something that is critically important to so many communities throughout this district, I just think it warrants a discussion. I understand you are stretched thin to begin with and that's why you're here today talking about the restoration of funding, which is gravely important and which I support your initiative on wholeheartedly, but I believe that it is -- it values a discussion. Because of the crises that we are currently facing to talk about opening it up for
a very small portion to help address this issue, which I think is going -- is multifaceted in regard to the solutions we have to come up with to resolve it. Because just one solution, and I think you'd agree with me, is not going to resolve the problem. It's going to be a multifaceted solution to dealing with this issue. But I completely understand your very persuasive argument and I thank you again because you are a starch advocate for the land preservation in this state and those advocates are very lucky to have you on their side.

PAT PATERSON: Thank you so much. And I really appreciate not on the opportunity to be here tonight but all the work that you do. You know, we're all really -- at the end of the day we're all kind of in this together and so it is always -- it is -- the offer is always open to sit down and talk and to continue to work to move forward to address this problem that we all agree is significant. Thank you.

REP. HARDING (107TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. Anyone else have a question? Yes, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH): I just want to -- I won't belabor the point made by Representative Harding but I do agree with him on this and you know, I'm very optimistic that the stamp, the Bill that would have the stamp program implemented will pass this year. I'm hopeful of that and I think it's a good start but I think we all recognize it's going to be enough money to deal with the magnitude of the problem that we face. And so -- and I do agree with Representative Harding that we need to take a close look at how do we really do the most to preserve the
-- you know, our lake and the other waterways in Connecticut. Thank you.


AMY PATTERSON: Thank you.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Appreciate it. Thanks for your patience and your testimony.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Nobody signed up for 7345 so I'll move on to HB 7348, AN ACT CONCERNING BONDING AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CLEAN WATER FUND PROJECT, and we have Bill Lucey. Mr. Lucey, welcome and thank you for your patience today.

BILL LUCEY: Thank you for yours. Yeah, thank you Co-Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Ranking Members and the rest of the members of the Committee. It's been a long night. I'll try and keep it short. So we're supporting HB 7348 and that's essentially just a re-write of the last language for the last biannual of the Clean Water Fund with one twist. We put in some funding for non-point source pollution and some coastal resiliency. There are some existing other proposals such as the green infrastructure bank that would also be a mechanism that's already for that. The Clean Water Fund is an existing mechanism. It's already set up to be able to handle funds like that, not currently staffed for that section. That's the Long Island Sound Clean-up Fund.

The one thing I wanted -- before I continue on, the Clean Water Fund has a provision, this is just food for thought, for river restoration that's never been used. I think has used about $700 in the entire
history, the Clean Water Fund so as you're looking at lake issues and river issues, invasive species issues you do potentially have existing infrastructure to deal with that.

Our big concern, the biggest pollution we have right now in our waterways and the Long Island Sound are the CSOs. Those are combined sewer overflows. When you get the storm water mixing with sewage and going into the rivers and going directly into Long Island Sound. Some of these have ultraviolet for sterilization. A lot of them still use chlorine and the effects on Anostomus fish, migrating eels, there's a lot -- that's a toxic chemical and it doesn't get dechlorinated like it does at a regular sewage treatment plant. So you're basically pool water and sewage into our local waters in hundreds of millions of gallons of volume. We want to keep the funding at the same level. We have a goal to get rid of these CSOs in 12 years. We may not keep that, but that is the goal. And what was proposed for this year was $75 million on GO bonding and just to give you an idea of how inadequate that is, Bridgeport alone we met with our WPCA, $650 million just to come up to clean water standards.

I have some pictures which I won't show you right now. It will probably ruin your appetite. I keep my Black Rock Harbor 40 feet from the outfall and it is a bubbling, oozing, cesspool. When they're cleaning their tanks you can smell it on I-95. There's communities living all around that. Talk about an environmental justice issue. There's people fishing all over that place and they're not wealthy enough to have boats to they're shoreline fishing catching stripers and corgis, basically and sewage. My time is up so I'll stop.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Lucey for your testimony and providing a little bit of education around the growth of this algae and how it's damaging our wildlife -- marine life rather. Any questions? Yes, Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair. Which treatment plan is that in Bridgeport? The West End?

BILL LUCEY: The West End. That's the worst one.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Isn't that the one that's set to be upgraded by either this year or beginning of next year?

BILL LUCEY: Well this year they put in RFPs to get the design. Next year they're going to do the design work and then they need to get clean water funding. They've authorized some of their own bonding but they need to get that paid back to the Clean Water Fund. Right now there isn't extra money in there. But hopefully in two years they'll be more geared up and we'll be able to get back up to a high level. Our concern is that we start -- if you put a graph, a regression line through the Clean Water Funding over the last five years, it's going like this. It's bumped up this year. They have about $650 million in revenue projects this year. So while our concern is it just going down, down, down as we have over $4 billion worth of needs. And it's not just Bridgeport. We talk with a lot of WPCA sewage plant operators in Derby. They need a pump station. They need $12 million. They paid for the first three out of their own, only municipal funds and you know, their rate -- they just got hit with a bill this year when the bond came due and you know, everyone is upset. So we really need to have this state support. It used to be the federal
government back in the 40s. And then in 87 it was restructured and since that time the funding has been going downhill.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): But correct me if I'm wrong; if I may Madam Chair. Correct me if I'm wrong but some additional or increased federal funds for Long Island Sound were just announced, but that's separate or that (crosstalk).

BILL LUCEY: Yeah, that's not --

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Is what we're potentially funding here matching funds?

BILL LUCEY: No, I don't think we're going to -- like the geographic funds that we have $14 million, last year we had $12 million. There was just a budget project process with that with the Citizen Advisory Committee for the Long Island Sound study that's not going toward sewer programs.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lucey.

BILL LUCEY: All right. Thanks.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. Nobody here for 6646 so we'll move on to HB 7347, AN ACT EXEMPTING SENIOR CITIZENS AND VETERANS FROM THE PASSPORT TO PARKS MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE. Is Eileen Grant here? Oh.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Eileen is not here but she sends her regards.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): (Laughing) Clearly I need to look up from my paper once in a while. Hello Eric, how are you?

ERIC HAMMERLING: Hello, hello.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Welcome Mr. Hammerling.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Thank you. Good evening and I'm the Executive Director of the Connecticut Forest and Park Association. CFPA was established in 1895, the oldest conservation organization in the state so you -- and our mission was to establish state parks and forests. So you won't be surprised I think that I'm here tonight to speak in opposition to HB 7347, AN ACT EXEMPTING SENIOR CITIZENS AND VETERANS FROM THE PASSPORT TO THE PARKS MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE. Coincidentally tomorrow is Friends of Connecticut State Parks Day in the concourse. And there will be volunteers here from over 25 organizations to enthusiastically show off their support of the Passport for the Parks and the parks themselves that they are supporting.

In 2018, its first full year the Passport provided a predictable revenue stream enabling DEEP to both hire and train seasonal staff earlier and budget more effectively to provide cleaner and safer facilities to over 9 million visitors. In 2018 all Connecticut residents enjoyed free entry to state parks. All campgrounds were open. Visitation was up by 10 percent and parks were safer and better cared for than they had been in several years. This was a direct benefit from the Passport funded by the noncommercial vehicle DMV registration charge of $5 a year per vehicle. However, before the Passport to the Parks became law in late 2017, parks were open to all but not all could afford access, especially
to the state's higher admission shoreline facilities. And the state parks system was facing an existential crisis. Four campgrounds have been closed. Hours and services were limited at state park facilities statewide. There were chronic shortages of critical seasonal workers like lifeguards and the potential closure or deepening neglect of parks was very real. The exemptions in HB 7347 would undermine the Passport, reverse the recent progress for the parks and encourage exemptions by other special categories. If that isn't enough of a reason to oppose HB 7347, please consider that Connecticut is old and getting older. That means that if HB 7347 passes the revenues to maintain the parks would decrease at the same time the demand by older residents for park services will increase. This is both unfortunate and unfair, especially since it is likely that both seniors and Veterans utilize parks as much as anyone. By opposing this Bill I mean no respect to seniors or Veterans. I have no doubt that if more seniors or Veterans knew how critical $5 per year per vehicle is the parks, they would be the first in line to oppose 7347. They understand sacrifice and they know that no one should be exempt from the responsibilities of citizenship or -- or obligations to Connecticut's future. Please oppose 7347. Leave the Passport intact to protect Connecticut's state parks for everyone to enjoy. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Hammerling. I think -- I can't speak for the whole Committee but I certainly know that the successes of the past parks program should be celebrated and we are grateful its in existence and hope to see its continued success. Certainly the concern of the seniors and the
Veterans is a valid one and one not to be ignored, but we have received testimony from agencies stating that it would be very difficult to implement such a discount program and it really is in its infancy, so really seeing how it plays out it becomes very important. That being said, we have heard from some folks that have several vehicles and you know, senior citizens that have several vehicles and it's become a concern. Do you see a point at which this might be a possibility?

ERIC HAMMERLING: Well yes, we have heard some comments from individuals who have several vehicles, but of course we're just talking about $5 a year per vehicle. If someone has several vehicles, thinking about $5 a year, that's two gallons of gas per vehicle. We're not asking people who don't have vehicles to pay this fee. This is only on vehicle registration so if someone doesn't have a vehicle it's not something they would pay. But if they do have one, we hope that they would be willing to contribute to the state parks that benefit everyone, even if someone doesn't ever go to visit a state park. They receive the benefit that comes to the state from the revenues that are attracted from state parks, over a billion dollars a year, 9,000 private sector jobs every year that are supported by the state parks. And we would hope again if the issue is someone with multiple cars, you know the money is there to be able to make that contribution to the state. And I guess I'll leave it at that. I hope that the spirit would be there for most people who are enjoying free access to the parks, that you know, they're getting that sure, for $5 a year. But just compare that to where folks were just two years ago before the Passport. To go one time to a
shoreline park, like Hammonasset in your district was $13 per visit. So to pay $5 a year and have free access to go as many times as you would like to the parks throughout the year I think is quite reasonable, and we hope this important program will be able to continue.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): And to that point, throughout the state, not just -- right, right.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Absolutely.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): So I appreciate that testimony and that answer. Thank you. Any comments or questions from the Committee? Yes, Representative Gresko.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): Who are you calling old? (Laughing)

ERIC HAMMERLING: Well I would look in the mirror and call myself old, so.

REP. GRESKO (121ST): So just as a quick statement, I -- you know the Bill hasn't been technically drafted yet. I asked for an estimated cost to the state and according to OFA to exempt seniors over the age of 65 would be $2.9 million in a fiscal note. So just an FYI. Thank you, Madam Chair.

ERIC HAMMERLING: I appreciate your raising that and also in the testimony offered by DEEP, they estimated $4 million for both seniors and Veterans, would be the loss to the state park system and that would be devastating since that's about a third of all of the funding for all of the state parks and obviously we hope that doesn't happen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. Thank you, Representative. And yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Excuse me. Prior to the Passport to Parks Law going into effect there were a number of groups of people who were exempt from paying a fee to the parks, right?

ERIC HAMMERLING: Prior to the Passport to the Parks, there were. Seniors and disabled Veterans.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. In my district there are a lot of Veterans and a lot of disabled Veterans and I can tell you that some of the disabled Veterans have no ability to get to a park and have no -- would get no benefit out of being in a park. And they have complained to me that they were previously exempt so they could go to a park for free and now they have to pay whether they go or not. And depending on how many cars they have; they have to pay multiple times. So you can imagine that some of the disabled Vets are kind of unhappy that they're being forced to pay for something that they will never used when they were previously exempt.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Well I think it's certainly a valid point but I would say that you know you're making quite an assumption that disabled Vets would never use the parks. And there were a lot of disabled Vets, there are a lot of Veterans, a lot of seniors who are using the parks throughout the year. They are, actually if you during the middle of the week, that's a time you will go to the parks and see lots of people, especially seniors who are using the parks. I don't think that that would be a reason why someone can't contribute towards the benefit of the parks. You know, as I tried to say in my
testimony; I don't think I said it particularly well, but we certainly appreciate the sacrifice the Veterans have made for our country and that seniors have also made for our country, but we see that the parks are a benefit for everyone and we think that everyone should contribute towards their success. And we hope that the $5 a year for you know, for additional on vehicle is not too much to ask.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Well I was making no assumptions. They actually told me that so I'm talking about specific people --

ERIC HAMMERLING: Okay.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): That were previously exempt. They could have gone to any park they wanted to for free and now they're paying for it whether they go or not. And I think in their situation you know we should give them some type of accommodation given what they've sacrificed for us.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Well I think -- you know again, I appreciate the point. I would though respectfully disagree in terms of -- as was mentioned, this will be very difficult for the state to actually implement. You know there are certain things that were brought up such as, what if you have co-owners of vehicles? One is a disabled Veteran one is not. What's the fair thing to do? The easiest thing to do to make sure the program runs as efficiently as possible and generates the revenue that's necessary to operate our parks without having to go back to the general fund for additional funding is to make sure that it applies to everyone equally. That's the most efficient way to run a program. And again, because I believe that everyone benefits from having
well-maintained state parks, we would hope that everyone would contribute toward them.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Do you know how many disabled Veterans there are in Connecticut?

ERIC HAMMERLING: I do not.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So you don't know if you would have to go to the general fund to replace the money if we exempted them?

ERIC HAMMERLING: Well I know what is coming for the Passport to the Parks is not enough for the state parks to self-sustaining right now. So a reduction in that amount will make it that much less self-sustaining, so but you're right, I do not know the exact number of disabled Veterans there are in Connecticut.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Well thank you for your answers. And I do think we owe it to the people who have given so much to us and have sacrificed so much, especially when we have always recognized them as being exempt from this fee and now we've suddenly decided to charge them. I -- you know, I frankly don't think that's fair.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Just one point though on that. They were not always exempted from paying this fee. That was a relatively recent thing you know, within the last 10-15 years so anyway, just to be on point with that. And again, I mean no disrespect to Veterans, disabled Veterans, seniors but I do hope that we're all able to contribute to make sure that we have well-maintained parks for everyone to enjoy. And for those people who previously weren't able to afford to go to parks because of the high --
relatively high compared to all surrounding states, admission fees; this really is a huge benefit to the public that I hope we won't diminish by making exemptions for any special category.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Well I disagree with you, but thank you for your answers.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, thank you Mr. Hammerling for your testimony.

ERIC HAMMERLING: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Okay. We are on to SB 1064 which is AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CARBON PRICE FOR FOSSIL FUELS SOLD IN CONNECTICUT. Is David Gable here? Welcome and thank you for your patience.

DAVID GABLE: Thank you for yours. Dear Members of the Environment Committee, my name is David Gable. I am the President of Hocon Gas, a family owned propane distribution company with 6 locations in our state. We have been in business for about 70 years. Our company and its affiliates employ 160 people and service roughly 30 thousand customers.

Although I appreciate the fine work the Committee does in protecting our environment but I strongly disagree with Raised Bill 1064. Clearly there is a movement underway in our state to electrify everything and this Bill's intent is to kill everything else in its way to accomplish that end goal in my opinion. One of the targets is propane, a core business of mine.

Propane is an exceptionally clean, low carbon and environmentally friendly fuel that plays a vital
role in our state and around the world. Here are some things you should know about it.

When the electric grid goes down, thousands of our -- of people in our state (coughing) excuse me, in our state fire their propane powered generators to restore electricity of homes as well as municipalities, state agencies and business. Propane has been exempted from the Liquid Underground Storage Container Act because of its inability to pollute. 4.3 million people die of indoor air pollution-caused illnesses. This is more deaths from malaria, HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis combined. Many of these deaths are now -- are now being avoided due to the greater use of propane as a cooking fuel, especially in third world nations which traditionally have used wood and cow manure as a primary cooking fuel.

27 million vehicles are powered by propane and it is the third most popular fuel worldwide. In our state alone, 500 school buses once powered by diesel fuel, are now running on -- cleanly on propane. Technology has advanced where the production of Renewable Propane is now possible and we believe this will play a vital role in tomorrow’s energy future. These are but few good things propane does today to assist governments in helping to achieving environmental goals.

I am very protective of propane and all the great things it accomplishes environmentally and I strongly oppose any legislative effort to harm or place such an unfriendly burden on a fuel that has worked so well in the past, now and should in the future. Our state should find more ways to incentivize the use of propane and not burden it
with an unnecessary Carbon Tax. We pay enough in taxes and another one like this is not welcomed. Thanks for giving me the time to speak.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Gable for your testimony. And are there any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks for coming in. Do you -- I -- were you here when Representative Steinberg was testifying about this Bill?

DAVID GABLE: I was in the adjoining room.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. I asked him about what's the alternative and he didn't seem to have one? Do you know of a -- of a good alternative for heating a home in rural areas other than propane or oil? Is there anything?

DAVID GABLE: You're asking a loaded question. Of course my opinion is going to say propane, but I mean there's -- there's a place for all forms of energy in this country and you can't just stick with one form. So you know, we've heard testimony about a power plant being built on the New York/Connecticut border and the emissions it will create. And we're experimenting with winds off the coast of Connecticut and solar farms and so on. And I think a mix, you can't depend on one thing because it's like a three-legged stool and generally one leg fails and something else needs to pick up. So I don't know that you could say there's one form of energy that's better than the other. Clearly we're moving toward a more electrical -- electrically oriented society and my opinion is that propane is a bridge fuel. Maybe -- maybe it stays for a long
time. Maybe it's got a 10 or 15 year lifespan. I
can't predict the future frankly.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): The problem comes when the
power goes out. You know in my district, in my
house and in my area power goes out all the time.
We lose power 10 times a year easily. What do you
do? Propane, oil, wood. It's pretty much your only
options. You know I can't see -- I just -- I don't
know an alternative and it just seems odd that we
would want to make things harder to use if there
isn't yet an alternative.

DAVID GABLE: I can't disagree. You need a
generator.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): We're probably not going to
disagree on that one.

DAVID GABLE: A backup generator. (Laughing)

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you for coming. I
appreciate it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative.
Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you. One of the
things we can do, right? I'm just picking up on one
thing in your testimony where you said the Bill's
intent is to -- the goal is to electrify everything
and the Bill's intent is to kill everything else to
accomplish that end goal. Really the Bill's intent
is to gradually shift the state away from fossil
fuel. And the reason we want to do this is that the
latest studies indicate we only have 12 years to
make this shift before we lose control of climate
change and it becomes unstoppable. So that's really
why we're doing it. It's not that we are aligning
up with the electric companies. It's that we are trying to protect our future population who will be greatly impacted if we don't fix this within 12 years.

And the other thing is, one of the things that will happen with the price shifting is you will get a move toward renewable technologies such as GO Thermal so you -- the temperature under the earth in Connecticut is around 54 or so year-round. So if you -- I have a couple of businesses in my district and one housing authority in my district that is already using this so they run the pump down into the underground and they get both heat and cooling, depending on the season, from underground. So that really reduces their power demand to heat and cool their house to very little 'cause they're getting most of the benefit now from the earth. So instead of having to heat from 10 degrees outside to 70 inside your house, now you just have to heat from 54 to 70, which is a lot less demand. And then in the summer instead of having to run your air conditioner all the time, you're just collecting the cool from the 54 degrees and you're cooling your house that way. So that's the kind of thing we think will happen as the price shifts. And we're really not trying to pick on your business. We really aren't. And we aren't -- at least I'm speaking for myself as one of the other people working on this. We're not trying to do favors for the electric company. We're simply trying to move us gradually away in that 12 years we have left so that our descendants will have a normal productive life in Connecticut and they won't be struggling to make it with an out of control climate situation. So we're intending --
we're well intentioned and we're just trying to move us away.

DAVID GABLE: And I completely understand that. There's a lot of time between now and 12 years so propane powered vehicles we heard some testimony about the city of Waterbury that's converted all of its diesel powered buses to -- they've abandoned their diesel powered vehicles and gone to propane powered vehicles. It's reduced emissions by -- greenhouse gas emissions by a number of tons to thousands of tons, and reduced their budget significantly. So a propane powered bus is slightly more expensive than a diesel powered bus but about a third of the cost of an electric powered bus. So an electric bus or vehicle in certain segments is not cost -- is not cost beneficial, it's too expensive. But ultimately we may get there in 12 years or 10 years. By that time the vehicles will cycle out two or three times and they can convert vehicles to propane today and reduce emissions by 25 to 30 percent.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): And then the other thing I wanted to ask you was, one of the other Bills we had today or maybe it's this one, talks about the -- it only goes into effect when our border states move, so there's a New England price and New York is not in the Bill now. But I'm thinking we probably should add it. What's your thought on if we make a move and the border states haven't made a move yet that puts you at a disadvantage.

DAVID GABLE: Absolutely.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Should we include -- should we make it apply to our -- alignment with all our
borders. So it would be Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New York.

DAVID GABLE: Well if you want to create a level playing field then all adjoining states need to have the same pricing scheme, otherwise companies that are located on the borders will have competitors that will be able to undercut them and not achieve the goals you're looking for.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. Thank you.

DAVID GABLE: You're welcome.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? Thank you for your testimony.

DAVID GABLE: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Is it John Shaer? Welcome. I hope I said your last name correctly.

JOHN SHAER: You did. Thank you for doing so. Chairwoman Cohen, Vice-Chairman, Ranking Members, and members of the Committee. Thank you very much for hearing us tonight. My name is John Shaer. I'm the Executive Director of the New England Convenience Store and Interview Marketers Association. NECSIMA is the acronym. We're based in Massachusetts and we represent single site convenience stores and gasoline retailers, chain convenience stores and gasoline -- chain convenience stores and chain gasoline retailers, wholesale motor fuel distributors and the businesses which supply all of them. According to the maps there are almost 1,700 convenience stores, almost 1,200 of which in Connecticut employ about 25,000 people and contribute over $6.5 billion dollars in sales. I've
submitted written testimony so my remarks will be brief. We're opposed to Senate Bill 1064, and I'll speak to two reasons why. I'm also going to focus my remarks on gasoline and diesel transportation fuels.

Number one, it will make -- it will make the already extremely high cost of transportation fuel in Connecticut even higher for all its residents, businesses and visitors to the state. According to the Georgetown Climate Center calculator, which is sort of the go-to for these things, a $15 per metric ton on carbon tax equates to .13 cents a gallon for gasoline, .15 cents a gallon extra for diesel. Then for every $5 increase as the Bill describes, it would add 4.5 cents per gallon approximately. This is on top of the already high gasoline and diesel prices in the state, which are .62 cents for gas and .68 cents for diesel. These costs, also we refer to them as having a multiplying effect because it isn't just people that are filling up their cars. It's how goods and services get transported around the state. So anybody that buys a head of lettuce for example is going to be paying the tax on top of that head of lettuce, etc., etc. So according to the United States Bureau of Transportation statistics, 63 percent of all freight in the country is moved by truck and 15 percent by rail. Both modes of transportation use diesel so 78.5 percent of all goods would become more expensive theoretically.

Number two. It's unfair to ask Connecticut residents and businesses to endure the financial burden of leading the way with carbon reduction. According to the US EPA and the United States Energy Information Administration Connecticut's 34 million metric tons of carbon dioxide ranked 39th out of 51
jurisdictions. That's the 50 states plus the District of Columbia. And represents -- that represents just 0.7 of total US emissions. Worth noting is that Connecticut's down 22 percent since 2005. I'll wrap up -- I'll wrap up here. This Bill has a three state trigger. So looking at just the three states referenced in the Bill, Connecticut, Mass and Rhode Island total emissions are still only 2 percent. So Connecticut's share of the carbon blame is fractional, small fraction in relation to the rest of the country.

The Transportation Climate Initiative which is the ten state jurisdiction is making a recommendation in the very near future. Our recommendation to the state would be to wait for that. A question earlier was about you know the -- the bordering states. So I'm not sure just a small four state solution is the answer but it -- it should really be the largest possible region and by largest possible region, I mean the world. If not the world, the country. Certainly throughout the country the 10 or 11 state region would be our recommendation to wait and see what those recommendations are versus again, having the state go out and do it on its own and burden the people that live here. Happy to take any questions.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Can you please tell me those numbers again? We paid -- we currently pay .65 cents in tax. That's state tax?

JOHN SHAER: Well you've got -- you have state, federal and your gross receipt tax.
REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So that includes --

JOHN SHAER: That's all in. Yeah, that all as well.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And then, so what's the state portion of it? It's about .43?

JOHN SHAER: Well yeah so, right. .43 and then there's -- you have .18 cents for the federal.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And this would add another .15 cents per gallon?

JOHN SHAER: Right. So in year one, which is the -- well .13 cents. The $15 per metric ton in year one equates to .13 cents a gallon on gas and .15 cents on diesel.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Can you tell me how many gallons of gas equals a metric ton of CO2?

JOHN SHAER: Not yet, not right now. I would probably get it to you but I don't have that information.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Can you tell me how many gallons of heating oil?

JOHN SHAER: No, I can't.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. All right. Thank you.

JOHN SHAER: Sure.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments? No? Thank you so much for your testimony.

JOHN SHAER: Thank you for your time.

LESLIE ANDERSON: Thank you members of the Committee. My name is Leslie Anderson. I'm the President of the Propane Gas Association of New England. We represent the six states here in New England and the propane industry within it. We have 101 Connecticut based companies that make -- are members of our association and over 200,000 Connecticut customers use clean green propane to heat their homes. We have over 2,500 employees that work in our industry and we strongly oppose HB 1064.

Most people don't realize that propane is a biproduct of natural gas. 5 percent of natural gas that's produced is propane. So when they process natural gas you have to do something with the propanes that's left there. If you believe in composting your trash and re-using it for something else, propane is just like that. You're re-using a beneficial biproduct. And it furthers the environmental goals to reduce, reuse and recycle here in this state.

Our electric grid in New England is 40 to 70 percent powered by natural gas. We have to do something responsibility with the 5 percent of propane that's left over in that. Around the world propane is being used to solve the greatest health threats to human kind. Over 4 million people a year die from indoor air pollution and propane is being used to offset that around the country. You heard the previous testimony by Dave Gable refer to this. When you move a family and in India they're moving 3 million families a year; when you move a family from wood to propane you save 265 tons of CO2. So...
multiple by that 3 million a year in the last three years and you can see the benefit that propane is a green partner, it's a renewable -- it's also being made into renewable propane and we are right now doing innovation to create propane -- renewal propane from algae. And if you tax this product it is going to stifle that innovation that's out there. So I really think it's important that we look about how propane is being used around the world to reduce CO2 and to combat climate change.

100 families that move from wood to propane save an acre of rain forest land in India, in Africa, in other countries, in Brazil. And so there's a lot of things that it's being done -- that it can help us with across the globe and here in New England. Propane microgrids are very big in Europe and are a potential for us here in New England for energy security. And also the extreme climate events that we have. Propane is the alternative. It feels the -- it heats up the milk for the baby bottles and shelters. We use propane for that. It has the generators for hospitals. It's a partner with solar. Solar needs to start back up or it needs to operate for studies in remote areas of the country and propane is what is used when the sun is not shining and when the wind doesn't blow. It's nontoxic. It does not contain any greenhouse gases, and it produces very little carbon dioxide when it's burned. It's a great solution for the State of Connecticut.

You talked about environmental justice earlier. This Bill as written will impact the poor disproportionately. They have cars that have less gas mileage than others. They're not going to be able to go out and install solar installations and
buy Teslas. They need a solution and their solution right now is wood. So if you implement this without anything on wood for a tax today you're going to cause more carbon dioxide, more nitrogen oxide, more health effects, more asthma and we really need to look at an alternative. Propane is a healthy alternative for low and middle income citizens. It would re-use a beneficial biproduct and it should be part of our strategic energy security plan that we have. It's the cleanest alternative out there. And when you look at a lifecycle analysis and you don't just measure an electric car and say nothing is coming out the tailpipe but you look at what goes into it and the energy it takes to generate the power to get to that car, the energy it takes to build a car with lighter aluminum that's produced in the factor in China where they're using coal to generate the power that makes that car that has the batteries that are picked up with heavy metals and toxics in them, propane is a much cleaner solution. And when you look at the lifecycle analysis of propane energy versus electric energy here in New England, propane wins and it has less carbon dioxide. So if the goal of this is to truly combat climate change we should be partnering with propane. We should exempt it from any kind of tax and we should look at it as a bridge to the future and then something we can keep using in our homes as we build renewable propane and that comes out. It's the perfect partner for us to move forward and it creates a solution and a backup for our electric grid. And I'm happy to take any of your questions. This is my third carbon tax hearing this week so yeah.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): You've got it down, Ms. Anderson. Thank you so much for your testimony. It's very informative. Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Are there other hearings in the other states? Some of our neighbor states?

LESLIE ANDERSON: Yes, so I've been to New Hampshire and I've been to Maine.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): That's 'cause we're coordinating with them. (Laughing)

LESLIE ANDERSON: On the Bills. The New Hampshire Bill was retained in Committee this year. The Maine Bill I don't expect to go very far. There was a huge opposition that showed up in that state against the Bill because of the cost that it's going to be. And we estimate the cost will be $1200 for a family of four when this Bill is fully implemented, which is a lot of money for a family, especially when I'm listening to testimony about a $5 fee for -- that's being complained about for parks right now. You know, $1200 is a lot of money and it's not going to be redistributed equally to everyone that pays into it.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): True but we -- what we expect to happen based on the experience in Canada is -- is the fee is applied, the equipment gets more and more efficient 'cause people are trying to squeeze more energy out of their fuel. So then you end up using fewer units of fuel because you have a more efficient system now. Your house is more efficient. Your car is more efficient. So it tends to drive efficiency.
LESLIE ANDERSON: So the industry has already reduced the amount of energy that's used by 40 percent over the last 20 years and energy efficiency is still out there. We offer as an association, rebates for people to install high efficiency equipment. Zero net energy housing a propane on-demand water heater is the cleanest way to go for that. It's lower than electric. Propane immediately heats up. If you have an electric stove versus a gas stove you know it's immediately hot. It uses less energy overall that's out there. The -- by taxing it though, what's going to happen is you're going to drive people to wood. The poor people are going to go to wood. People are going to import wood into the state, which is going to cause more invasive people and everything else. So I really think you should consider propane as a biproduct being exempt from this, any kind of a rule and being the solution for people that -- so they don't turn to wood in the interim period of time as you go through.

And also for the energy security. And attached to my testimony is a page that talks about the energy security and the risks that you have here. I know that's very important to the -- to Connecticut to be included and propane is the solution for that.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. I think your point on wood is well taken and we probably should add wood to the list of fuels because it does produce CO2 when burned. What -- if you -- if you look in the part of the Bill from 51 -- line 51 to 59, the fee is charged at the rate per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent so if your fuel is cleaner than oil or coal, your fuel will have a smaller charge.
LESLIE ANDERSON: My fuel had a smaller charge but it's not applied equally when it comes to electricity because you're only charging people for the electricity that they use and 70 percent of the power is lost in transmission before it gets to your house. So you're only charge for 30 percent of what it truly costs to generate that electricity. So I'm not on an even playing field with electricity the way that the Bill is written right now.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. So we might have to go back further up the chain?

LESLIE ANDERSON: Yeah.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): But if you're -- the way I'm reading this language is, and this is the intention, is that if your fuel is cleaner than your rival's fuel, business is going to flow to you because you're going to have the lower rate.

LESLIE ANDERSON: Well, it will flow to me over the other fuels that are there because I'm cleaner than they are. But we are already working with lots of customers that are low income in our communities and this is going to be a huge impact. For propane it's a little less than .09 cents a gallon on the first year that you have the Bill. But it's much higher for gasoline and it's higher for the others and I'm sure that some of the other people that are testifying can give you the rates for the other products that are out there. But it's a big expense to put in. I think that the industry, my industry at least as worked so hard trying to promote energy efficiency and to help people reduce the amount of energy that they currently use and consume and we're working around the world cleaning up people in other -- other parts of the country. You know we export
more propane now than we use in the US. And if we were using as much propane as we could here in Connecticut in the heavier vehicles for our transportation industry we could be getting much more bang for the buck in the dollars that we spend because we could convert propane buses versus electric at 3 to 1, you know if we did that. And we would have an equal emission reduction if you measure it over the life cycle of what it takes to produce those energies. I mean there's nothing coming out of the tailpipe of an electric vehicle but there's a lot of things going into it. And we have to look at this holistically if we're really trying to reduce global CO2 emissions.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Right. So the whole life cycle?

LESLIE ANDERSON: Yeah.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): I got it. Okay. Well, thank you.

LESLIE ANDERSON: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you for coming in. Your knowledge is propane is extensive obviously. Do you know of any efforts to make propane powered airplanes?

LESLIE ANDERSON: Well there's propane powered drones that are out there and there are some remote controlled propane powered airplanes. I don't know it has been used on a larger scale than that for commercial applications yet but there are propane
boat motors that are out there. They don't go very fast right now because the Coast Guard hasn't gone through the whole approval process that they have -- have on them here in the United States, but we do have trolling motors and things like that, which you think about pollution and eliminating pollution in our lakes and things, it's much better to have that than a liquid fuel. And my background, I'm an Environmental Attorney. I have a Master's in Environmental Management. I spent two years at the Environmental Protection in the state of Maine heading up the bureau there. I'm an environmentalist at heart and I truly believe that this is the best fuel solution that we have here in New England, especially given the rural nature of our state up here, of the amount of fractured bedrock that we have. We want a product that's nontoxic, that doesn't pollute water, or grand water and that is available. You know propane is blessed by chemistry. It expands 420 times when you release it and so we can put 5 gallons in a barbeque tank and we can use it to cook on for several days. And you can move it remotely when you need to as well. So it's perfect for energy security and a very clean, efficient burning fuel.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): You know you say that you've seen boat motors. Any cargo ships or passenger vehicles or boats or anything like that in regards to it?

LESLIE ANDERSON: Well actually there is a lot of propane that's being used now on large tankers and large containerships that move overseas. It's -- there's new regulations on the marine side as to what the boats -- the large ocean going vessels, what kind of engines they can have and there's a
huge movement right now where they're building a lot of new containership that have propane motors on them because it meets all the requirements and it's -- the only thing that's produced is CO2 from it. There's no toxic, no ozone depleting chemicals that come out of it. So we are seeing it in large containerships, ocean going vessels that are going across the globe. There's quite a bit of movement on that side.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments or questions? Okay seeing none, thank you, Ms. Anderson for your testimony. Ralph Carlo. Welcome.

RALPH CARLO: Thank you very much. Good evening Committee, Madam Chairman. My name is Ralph Carlo. My wife and I own Tracy Energy Services. We're a retail heating oil company based in New Haven. We're celebrating our 88th year. I'm here tonight to testify in opposition of the Bill that we have here on the table.

I didn't bring my notes because I ran up here late this afternoon when Chris, our Executive Director said he wanted to have some more people testifying today. I did have a prepared statement, which I will send in in writing and I know I only have three minutes so I'm going to kind of make it quick.

I'm going to talk about a little bit -- the two points would be how this tax would affect not only just urban consumers that I deal with in New Haven but senior citizens also in particular. This is going to raise the price of heating oil per gallon,
in the first year close to .16 cents. I think that's sort of an unfair burden to put on our citizens, our consumers, my customers mostly because the -- I don't think the tax is really going to do what your intent is. It has been shown before that a carbon tax does not reduce the use of the fuel. It's not econ 101. You don't raise the price and people are going to stop using it. We as an industry have really done a great job of reducing the use of heating oil. We also introduced the biofuel component. My company delivers a B20 product, so 20 percent of the heating oil that we deliver is a renewable product. I really think that the direction we should be going in is more in the line of tax credits for renewable fuels. Going into something Massachusetts is doing which is a TREC program. Again, to keep this short I'm concerned about my customers, the senior citizens, the minorities. Even just moderate income families aren't going to be able to afford you know, another tax on top of a heating product. That's about it. Again, I really think that the direction would be from a different solution than trying to tax something to have people switch or try to lessen their use. There isn't going to be much less that people can use. If anybody has any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. Carlo. Any questions or comments from the Committee? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Do you know how many gallons of heating fuel it takes to produce one ton of CO2.
RALPH CARLO: I'm happy you asked me that question because I did my homework while I was sitting over there. (Laughing) Actually it's 98 gallons.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): 98 gallons?

RALPH CARLO: 98 gallons. I think I did my math right. Chris might be able to fix that for me but -- no, I think I'm right.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So let's say it's $100 --

RALPH CARLO: That's what Google told me, yeah.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): So we're going to be adding $15 for each hundred gallons --

RALPH CARLO: Hundred gallons of delivery.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Of heating fuel.

RALPH CARLO: That's correct.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. That's pretty significant. All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

RALPH CARLO: Anybody else?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair.

RALPH CARLO: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative and thank you Mr. Carlo. Up next is Michael Morrissey. Welcome Mr. Morrissey.

MICHAEL MORRISSEY: Good evening Senator Cohen, Representative Demicco, Ranking Members. I am Mike Morrissey with the Alternative Fuels Coalition of Connecticut. We are an active participant and
member of the Clean Cities Coalition and it's local coalitions here in Connecticut. I'm here to speak against raise Bill 1064. And let me use a warehouse forklift to illustrate why we think this is not a good Bill. For as long as I can remember the only two types of lift trucks that were allowed to operated inside buildings were ones powered by either propane or electricity. Using any other kind fuel inside a building where people were working would kill you. Propane powered lift trucks are exceptionally clean and we feel that this fuel ought not to be penalized, especially when it operates as cleanly as electricity inside a workplace.

In fact propane does a lot of things that benefit our environment. It heats homes and businesses, provides domestic and commercial hot water, heats meals both inside and out, dries clothes and fuels fireplaces. And it's an excellent transportation fuel. Over 27 million vehicles worldwide run on propane. It's the third leading transportation fuel in the world.

Back in 1992 the federal government designated six additional fuels as viable alternatives to our conventional fuels. A few of those you know by biodiesel, hydrogen and a few others. The federal government at the tie and a short while later created incentives for all of these fuels. Propane was one of the six fuels on this list. To put an additional tax on the fuel is counterproductive and penalizes a fuel that is already contributing to our environment. That completes my testimony and I thank you very much for the time.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Mr. Morrissey. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, I thank you again.

MICHAEL MORRISSEY: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Mr. Steve Sack.

STEVE SACK: My name is Steve Sack from Sack Energy in Hartford. I just want to say hello and thank you for this evening, Committee. I'm here today to ask you to reject all carbon taxes including Bill 1064. The taxpayers of the state cannot afford another tax that will not solve any problems. Yes, the 1 percenters can afford it but the 99 percenters can't and should not be paying more and more to live in the state when too many people are just trying to put food on their table.

I'm a wholesaler of heating fuels and driving fuels based in the state. When I look at this new tax I don't see how it will reduce carbon burn in our state. The -- maybe, and I question the maybe refunds to taxpayers will be getting -- will not be getting back to the taxpayers to go into energy savings. The money is going to be putting the food on the tables and pay bills that are late. As an example, many people are renters so they will not be putting the rebates in energy upgrades into someone else's property. There are just so many flaws into the thinking behind this concept. This is just one example of the issues with this Bill. There are other available ways to reduce and incentivize carbon reduction without a tax or a cost to the people of Connecticut.

Our industry has been blending biodiesel into home heating oil now called bioheat. There was a Thermal
Rec Bill 5380 out there that incentivizes use of a class 1 renewable fuel, bioheat at no cost to the taxpayers and can have a major reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in most homes. Also SB 232 to stop the leaking of natural gas lines, a report from Yale 360 Environment was done in Massachusetts and claims that if all the leaking natural gas lines in Mass were fixed then there would be a reduction of 12 percent in the greenhouse gas emissions. These are two options that can reduce greenhouse gas emission in our state by over 30 percent at no cost.

I beg this Committee to really look at the carbon tax bill and fully understand how it works, and mostly how it does not work and it will not achieve its goal in reducing our carbon footprint and will only be another tax we can't afford.

I just want to talk about a couple comments that were made earlier today. They talked about natural gas. It is a fossil fuel that will be taxed also in the Bill. You talk about biodiesel, about a power plant up in Killingly. It's a duel fuel plant. That could also run on biodiesel, not natural gas only. And that's my testimony. If you have any questions?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you Mr. Sack for your testimony and I appreciate your comments about gas leakage. As you probably know this Committee had a Bill before us on -- to repair that problem to the extent possible from an environmental standpoint and certainly from -- and -- not only aging pipes but to also help the consumer so that we are not picking up that gas leakage price in the end. That Bill did JF out of Committee. Are there any questions or comments from Mr. Sack on this particular Bill before us? No? Thank you so much.
STEVEN SACK: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Dave Sousa. Welcome Mr. Sousa.

DAVE SOUSA: Thank you all for your time and consideration in my testimony. I just want to let you guys all know that it's my birthday and I'm glad I could share it with all of you, all right? (Laughing) Thank you. 37 and you know, not a special one overly, but. Probably at my house with my wife and two kids. Otherwise I'll be sleeping in the dog house. All right.

My name is David Sousa. I'm an S1 Unlimited heating, piping and cooling contractor and I own J&A Waterville Oil Service in Naugatuck, Connecticut. I've worked there for 15 years. I'm in opposition to Senate Bill 1064 because it makes it artificially difficult and unfair for me to operate my business and it's a regressive tax that will push more people away from this state.

Much like the federal green new deal, this carbon tax will undermine Connecticut's economy. Did you see what happened in France in 2018 with their carbon taxes? The people rioted, so I don't want to see that happen here. Instead you should consider that the oil industry is willingly in the process of getting better for the environment through improving technology that better utilizes biofuel. Higher blends of biofuel are considered carbon neutral or even net carbon reducers when taking into account the lifecycle of the fuel. Many in the public hearing room, they'll file oil industry and see its proponents as adversaries. Instead everyone should be looking at us as allies that share common goals to help achieve overall comfort, efficiency, carbon
reduction and most importantly a sustainable planet with the help of a great product called biofuel.

Renewables over time have not proven themselves yet. Heat pumps will not keep people warm on the coldest of days because you cannot change the laws of chemistry and physics, not to mention they run on hydrocarbon based refrigerants that at some point leak directly to the atmosphere. The original intent of installing this equipment -- where was I -- is to be better for the environment but time and time again the world proves us that we don't know it all. The refrigerant that these heat pumps utilize, which is our 410A as the same global warming potential as the refrigerant that they're trying to phase out, which is R22. By installing this equipment we may have the best of intentions but we'll end up emitting just as much carbon when all is said and done. Meanwhile consumers may ultimately pay more out of pocket for equipment, repairs and future taxes on electricity when carbon emissions have been eliminated. That money is not going to go away, you're just going to tax electricity instead. That's all.

As you can see it's a slippery slope. To conclude, I hope that we can all get behind biofuel and utilize it to meet the heating needs of the population in an environmentally responsible and mutually beneficial way. Tax is not the answer. The oil industry is already working toward becoming more environmentally friendly and please stop moving the goal posts and oppose Senate Bill 1064, so.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much for your testimony, Mr. Sousa.

DAVE SOUSA: Thank you. Any questions?
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): It looks like Representative Michel has a question or a comment.

DAVE SOUSA: Sure.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. Just for France the reference I think you made to the Yellow Jackets. That part of the Yellow Jackets was extreme right protesting against it, just as a comment.

DAVE SOUSA: Was it -- was it in the -- it was in 2018. I saw there was one recently, as recently as yesterday I believe.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): It's not really stopped. But those that are arguing against the gas tax are really the extreme right wing, which is not necessarily the majority of the political associations in France.

DAVE SOUSA: Okay.

REP. MICHEL (146TH): But cool, a French reference. (Laughing) Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Did you know you had a French resource on this Committee?

DAVE SOUSA: Apparently I do. That's wonderful. (Laughing)

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yes, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Madam Chair and thanks for hanging in there so late here this evening. And as I've listened today you know and I hear in 12 years we're faced with some calamity known or unknown exactly and so what I got thinking about is if it's not only the tax that we're talking
about adding on to the cost of fuel, to incent the population to convert to more, let's say energy efficient or carbon free emissions, what we're then forcing on the citizens is the replacement of equipment. And I'm curious, do you know the average -- so if I had a 30 year old furnace and I wanted to go to a more modern furnace that was going to burn more efficiently and put less into the environment what's the cost today to convert, let's say for a 1500 square foot home in Connecticut?

DAVE SOUSA: You know, it really depends on who you're contractor is and what type of parts and materials they're going to be installing. I mean one contractor is much different from the next. Some will give you a bare bones nitty-gritty down and dirty heating system. Others will sell you; you know everything that the world has in it. So that's a loaded question.

REP. WILSON (66TH): I'm not trying to get a -- I'm not trying to get a quote here from you (laughing) but give me the bare bones down and dirty, what I'm going to is how many of those are going -- whether -- let's say converting to propane and I don't know if that's in your wheel house, but if we converted to propane, what's the average cost going to be and then I want to multiply it by how many homes are we going to have to do it in and how are those families going to afford it in addition to the tax?

DAVE SOUSA: Right. So as far as -- it's -- here's why it's a difficult comparison. Not only are the factors that I just mentioned but different fuels have different costs associated with them as well, and they also have different carbon emissions per gallon or ton, whatever your measurement may be.
You know, it seems like everyone wants to go the route of electrification, however, that's going to put a bigger strain on the electrical grid and/or whatever renewables that you're using whether it be solar or you're powering your house with a generator. I mean it's -- there's a lot -- it's very, very complicated is really what it is. So what will end up happening is, once everyone has been eliminated from the hydrocarbon grid if you will for lack of a better term, people are just you know, going to have more electrification in forms of air source heat pumps, maybe GO thermal, what have you. But what will end up happening is then you know, I -- I'm not intending this to be derogatory in any way, but usually that when I see taxes instituted they never really get repealed. So as soon as the carbon -- everyone stays away from carbon all the sudden you have no more revenue coming in and you're just going to be taxing electricity instead. So you know you're still going to have budgets to balance and you're still going to have problems with you know trying to you know get everybody there or even go even further from there. Who knows.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Okay, thanks. I don't think I got my answer.

DAVE SOUSA: I'm sorry. (Laughing)

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions or comments from the Committee? Happy Birthday. Enjoy the rest of your night. You've got a couple more hours. Awe, that was nice, Representative. (Laughing) Okay. All right. David Cohen. Okay. He is not here. Eric Gottier? Did I say that right? Okay, Gottier. Welcome. If
you could just push your mic button and state your name again for me.

ERIC GOTTIER: My name is Eric Gottier and this is Jason Gottier, my nephew. My uncle and my father started the heating oil business in 1960, which I'm very proud of. And to this day I can say I'm even prouder that going on this summer will be four years that we are no longer a heating oil company, we are now a bioheat company. And it's been a tremendous success story not only from a standpoint as a business, as an owner, but as our customers to produce -- to deliver a fuel that's truly renewable. And Jason has some information and will take it from here.

JASON GOTTIER: Thank you. Just to reiterate, I am the third generation of a local small business and again we are formally known as a heating oil company but we are now a bioheat company selling a product that is made partially from renewable resource working our way towards carbon neutrality. I honestly have no idea how this tax would effect large businesses but I can attest to how carbon tax would effect a small home heating business and our customers. Every day we are in the homes of our neighbors keeping their heat running and their homes warm. From knowing our customers so well and speaking to them on a daily basis it gives us insight into how such a regressive tax would affect them.

From what I see each day I know this would effect our low-income families and our elderly neighbors far more than anything else. Instead of a regressive tax I think a greater focus on home efficiency, heating system updates and bioheat would
achieve our goals faster and with no detriment to the populous. My uncle and I have both become building envelope and building performance analysts from the Nationally Recognized Building Performance Institute and as a BPI professional we are able to help families lower their fuel usage and carbon footprint through making a tighter and more efficient home while saving them money.

Secondly, added funding for disadvantaged families to update their existing heating symptoms could significantly lower their fuel usage. I know there are some programs that already exist and added funding could only help.

Lastly and most significantly is the current usage of ultralow sulfur, bioheat home heating fuel. This has drastically reduced our carbon emissions while introducing a renewable resource into our home heating fuel supply that makes our delivered fuel cleaner and more efficient to heat our homes. Thank you.

ERIC GOTTIER: Just to reiterate the importance of bioheat in this whole discussion. We made a commitment four years ago, not necessarily a -- I guess sometimes we call it a business commitment but it's really a commitment to our customers. This entire -- our entire area, there's a concern for being green and that's what this whole thing is about, a carbon tax. We're trying to -- trying to do the right thing whether it's for our children or our grandchildren, however you want to break it down. I look around and we've got second and third generation customers that come to us, myself, Jason and ask us questions as far as how they can be more efficient and we go out of our way to do and also to
incentivize replacing equipment. There was a question the other day -- just a few minutes ago concerning the cost of replacement. We put a brand new high-efficiency bioheat system in two days ago and it was approximately $6500. And we removed a 35 year old system from a home.

Increasing efficiency for a customer that a) was looking to increase their efficiency, they wanted more hot water on top of it. And b) the fact that they're going to end up burning less oil. Well that's kind of a negative on a business perspective but it's really what we're striving for because we're all in this together. And I say we're in this together; there's a certain element that you say, well you know if we just keep doing what we're doing we'll keep our customers at the average, I think is about 1000 gallons a year, which maybe that makes us big and fat and happy as oilmen but the reality is we need to contribute you know on a statewide basis to get all of our customers on the same boat, to bring them all down to seven where we're at now, which is 700 gallons a year on the average customer. That's hurting our business technically. Reality is we're saving our business because we're competing against gas, we're competing against propane. We have a natural competition that makes us more efficient. Putting a regressive tax on it, which would burden our low-income customers, which we have quite a few and our elderly customers who can't really afford that upgrade that I'm talking about now. That's going to put a burden on them that's not going to go away. And in fact that's going to increase. Whether they're renting that home as they talked about before or they actually own that home.
That's a burden that shouldn't be put on them. Not by our own state, so.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you.

ERIC GOTTIER: If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Yeah, I appreciate your testimony and your efforts to move to greener energy. Any questions or comments? Yes, Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Madam Chair. What does it mean that you are now a bioheat company?

ERIC GOTTIER: Good question. So what we do, bioheat is a renewable product and the amazing part is when we look at the state we're losing industry, we're losing a lot of businesses and part of our greatest secret and maybe it's our own fault, is we have a bioheat plant down in New Haven that produces more bioheat energy than any plant in New England. That -- that -- that bioheat is then mixed with heating oil and we can mix it at different ratios which we can increase to get even cleaner fuel. So we -- we create jobs in Connecticut, we benefit our economy, we create a -- we are all concerned about dependence on foreign oil. Well if we take a 20 percent mixture of bioheat, so that's 20 percent out of our whole state that we've eliminated as a -- as a foreign fuel.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So that's what you sell? You sell 20 percent?

ERIC GOTTIER: Well we're working our way up to that. And part of what happens is there's not -- there's not set regulations and what we're bumping
up against quite frankly is, we have the state of Massachusetts, somebody eluded to TREC which basically it's a thermal renewable energy credit that is produced and in the state of Massachusetts you get credit for that. You build these credits up and then they can be sold to electric companies, companies that are producing nonrenewable energy. So it's their way of getting -- their way of getting out of jail I guess you might want to put it. Their way -- their way of feeling good. They're required to do that and we can do that as an industry, as a bioheat industry.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. What percentage do you sell?

ERIC GOTTIER: We're about 10 percent right now.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. So 90 percent of your product is petroleum based diesel fuel?

ERIC GOTTIER: Correct. Yep.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. And that would be the portion that would be taxed?

ERIC GOTTIER: Correct.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other comments, questions? No? Thank you both for your testimony.

ERIC GOTTIER: Thank you, appreciate it.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Rick Glowina?

RICK GLOWINA: It's still evening.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): It is, thankfully.

RICK GLOWINA: Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you for your patience.

RICK GLOWINA: My name is Richard Glowina and I want to thank the Committee for allowing me to testify and speak against Senate Bill 1064. I'm here as a private citizen and I'm here speaking against this for a third year in a row. And I think enough is enough. This tax has several far-reaching implications. It's got a triple down effect that won't be -- that will impose astronomical levies to say the very least. Customers will see an increase in all goods and services due to the higher cost operating -- delivery vehicles, service vehicles and the cost to maintain heat in buildings just to mention a few. If you're looking for an excuse for corporations to leave for greener pastures, this is just another nail in their coffin. It will also cause more individuals to leave the state of Connecticut, talented tax paying individuals like myself.

So I did an analysis of my own day-to-day activities just to show you what this impact is going to be. I'm a salesman. I travel for my job. I purchased 1,296 gallons of gasoline directed attributed to my business mileage. In year one this will cost me an additional $171.97 in taxes. My wife and I also purchased approximately 780 additional gallons for personal use, adding another $103.51 in tax burden. Looking at my heating bills I purchased 827 gallons of fuel to heat my home and make hot water.

In year one that will cost $136.86 in taxes. So my total year one direct tax implication will $412.34
and that's just in year one. And they've got escalators built into this Bill. I can't afford it. What's my alternative? Move out of state. If we extend this out over the five year period it's going to come out to be $1036.24. I'll tell you I won't be here to pay that. I can't -- I can't say enough how upset I am with this Bill and the fact that this Bill keeps coming before this Committee. It's a regressive tax. It shows no positive. I understand what you're trying to do is limited the carbon footprint. You've heard some great alternatives here today from other fuels and other forms of energy. I think that's the right way to go and incentivize those instead of putting a regressive tax on -- on the citizens of this state. Thank you.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you, sir for your testimony. Any questions or comments? No?

RICK GLOWINA: A point for Representative Dubitsky.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Please.

RICK GLOWINA: It is 161.3 pounds of CO2 for million BTUs for fuel oil. It's 117 pounds for electric and it's 157.2 for gasoline. Those are your numbers.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): What was that?

RICK GLOWINA: The gasoline? Is 157.2 pounds per million BTUs.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): What's that in gallons?

RICK GLOWINA: Fourth grade math was the hardest three years of my life. (Laughing)

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): 140,000 BTUs in a gallon?

RICK GLOWINA: Yeah, 140,000 BTUs in a gallon of oil.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Could you just repeat that? How many BTUs in a -- I'm sorry, one more time. There was a cough going on.

RICK GLOWINA: 140,000 BTUs in one gallon of fuel. Okay. And it's 91,500 in a gallon of propane.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you both very much. Any other questions or comments? Okay. Thank you so much, sir. Next is Andy Tatakis.

ANDY TATAKIS: Thank you folks for staying here all day.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you.

ANDY TATAKIS: I was kind of nervous in the beginning with all the whispering going on but thank you for sticking it out and listening to us today.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): We appreciate your patience.

ANDY TATAKIS: My name is Andrew Tatakis. I'm sorry, good evening Madam Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name is Andrew Tatakis and I've been a citizen of Connecticut for 60 years. That's all, just 60. And in that time I've worked in fuel oil, kerosene and also gotten some propane and that's where I've been for the last 38 years. And with the propane side of it, you've heard a lot of numbers, a lot of numbers flying around, price per gallon, where it's heading, what's going to happen. Of course nobody likes a lot of taxes and that's a problem. Customers complain. You know we hear; my job is I work for Taratin Industries. We're a wholesale parts and equipment supply company in New England and we take care of the customers in Connecticut and surrounding states. And in my travels you know, you hear some scuttlebutt from
time to time about how expensive it is to do business, especially in Connecticut.

I turned around and one guy is selling the company because it's getting crazy with the regulations and another fellow is selling the company because you know, it's getting too expensive to do business in Connecticut. And to see this high carbon price to reduce emissions really is going to hurt the economy I feel with the prices being so high and expensive with the economy rises every day with expenses. With -- you the seniors, you have our Veterans, you have people that are having a difficult time struggling to pay their Bills and then we come along with pretty decent propane here. We're talking propane, we're talking efficiencies, we're talking worldwide global how important it is to get the pollution out of the air and we're part of the Clean Air Act and work very hard in emissions with our vehicles and even we operate our vehicles also on propane and it's more cleaner burning and it's just a better fuel as we've all been discussing here.

But the average consumption of the delivered fuels including propane has increased by 40 percent over 15 years. We're on the right track, got the momentum going, but the alarm clock goes on and then you've got to go home. But you know, basically a lot of good things have been said and I'm bypassing a lot of things I had written down here. But the propane consumed in the United States is producing in North American. There's a lot of energy security to talk about but we have a lot of propane in the United States and as Leslie said earlier we do get some propane off of scrubbing and washing the natural gas that comes out of the ground and burning it into the atmosphere is not going to help us. So
instead of burning it in the atmosphere, we reuse it, we sell it and we put in our equipment and move on about our daily business.

So I ask you all to really reconsider this and just think about this tax to the point where, I know we talked about the economy and we talked about the business people, the propane companies in this state of Connecticut have really gone the extra mile and have put hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars into increasing their storage facilities. And of course increasing their storage facilities add security in producing the propane for the customers. So thank you very much for your time again. God bless you all. Have a great evening.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Anybody have any questions for Mr. Tatakis? No? I guess we're all set.

ANDY TATAKIS: Great.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Mr. Tatakis. Thank you for your patience and your testimony. So the next person is Brian Sorel. Brian had to leave. Okay. Mr. Chris Herb, you are up followed by Joanne Flaum.

CHRIS HERB: Thank you. My name is Chris Herb. I'm the President of the Connecticut Energy Market Association. We represent about 600 home heating and propane dealers here in Connecticut. Our members also engage in the sale of home -- gasoline and diesel fuel. They own and operate and delivery fuel to about 1000 gas stations throughout the state so we are the liquid fuels representatives in the state.
All of the math has been done for Representative Dubitsky and it is in our testimony. We converted everything to gallons so you know exactly what the prices are. Just to throw a few of them out, and you've heard some of this in previous testimony. Year one it's .15 cents on gasoline, .17 cents on heating oil and diesel without the biodiesel blend in it. We're talking about .10 cents for propane. Natural gas in year one .09 cents and then so on and it continues to go up. The total economic cost to the State of Connecticut in year one for gasoline alone is $235 million. By year ten it's almost a billion and just to put that into perspective, this tax will raise more than your petroleum gross earnings tax and your gasoline excise tax by about the third year. So we've lived with the highest gasoline taxes and diesel taxes in the region for decades and this would just add to that. And I can -- and you can imagine what impact that has.

Gasoline, heating oil, propane, diesel fuel are very inelastic. People don't use less. When we -- when gasoline prices were at $4 a gallon we used 1.2 billion gallons of gasoline. When gasoline prices went under $2 a gallon we used about 1.2 billion gallons of gasoline, because people have to go to work. People don't get in their cars and drive for hours on end. So when it's cold out, you have to heat your house.

We've reduced the amount of fuel oil that's used in a home from 1200 gallons to 700 gallons through renovation, higher efficiency technologies. And those technologies are going to continue to get better in the future. But at the end of the day, this tax -- one of my members said to me; you know what Chris, I'm not going to come up tonight because
a faulty premise equals a faulty conclusion and this Bill is based on faulty premise that taxing it will have people stop using fuel and that's exactly what the numbers bear out. We have inelastic motor fuels market. We have an inelastic heating fuels market so all you do is punish people. You don't -- they don't convert to another -- some other magic fuel that's out there that's not going to cause emissions. Electricity causes emissions. There is no magic solution to this except for conserving and we have in place the tools to do that. So we're opposed to 1064 vehemently. There's a solution on the table, the TREC Bill which has been referenced a few times, 5380 to incentivize the higher blends of biodiesel with home heating oil and the reason why that's important at 2 percent biodiesel blend, you're cleaner than natural gas. From a particulate standpoint, from a knox, a sox and a carbon dioxide standpoint. The solution is before the legislature for the third year in a row and has not moved forward because there's a lot of interest out there who don't want to see it.

When you get to -- and that -- so at just 2 percent. Higher blends become carbon neutral and the purpose for that is because biodiesel is made up of two basic feedstocks. Used cooking oil and greases, so we take all the stuff that used to go into landfills and we burn it at a nearly B2 equivalency, a low or no-carbon output and then we grow it.

Soy, canola, and when we grow it we don’t use the meal that continues to feed the world, goes to feed the world, but 20 percent of that soybean is oil. We use that oil, which also nearly a B2 equivalent to fuel oil, at a low -- very low carbon output. And like you said, because the product is grown it
can get to carbon neutrality because plants consume carbon dioxide. So we have solutions but we keep seeing the people who support this Bill to bring back those taxes. The faulty premise is equally a faulty conclusions. It doesn't help any of your constituents, it doesn't help our economy, it doesn't help the hundreds of small businesses in this state.

The other thing is to just kind of boil it down and we included in our testimony an infographic. Like I said, the average family with two cars that heats their home and consumes electricity is $1300 after ten years. You're just hurting people if this Bill passes and I know it won't because that's not what you were sent here to Hartford to do and I'm confident you won't do that. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Okay. Thank you for your testimony and waiting it out this long all day. I'll ask -- ah, Representative Wilson.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thanks for staying so long. You --

CHRIS HERB: It's not my birthday. (Laughing)

REP. WILSON (66TH): Well you make us feel good anyway because you stayed, so we stayed. And I don't know whether you can help me with that question that I asked earlier but what I'm trying to get to is it's not just the tax and as you indicated in your presentation just now, people aren't going to go out and spend the money to replace their equipment because they can't afford to do it. Is there any kind of cost benefit analysis that's done on the equipment side? So what is it that I'm going
to convert to and what's my cost and where's the money going to come from?

CHRIS HERB: Well I -- number one, I wouldn't be -- because biodiesel blending can get either carbon neutrality or using clean propane solves these issues I would recommend converting to anything. But if you were to upgrade to a high efficiency heating system from let's say something that's you know 20-30 years old, those costs can range depending on previous testimony. Didn't get to the number, which I will, but as low as around $7,000 to as high as $12-15,000 depending on the efficiency rating, depending on if duct work needs to be done. There's lots of factors but I would say that that's your safe range. Bare bones, lower end, 1500 square foot average home like you asked could be anywhere in that $17,000 to $15,000 range.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Okay. Thank you so much.

CHRIS HERB: I have two single moms that work for me that could not do that. They would -- they would not. They would just continue to either dial down or get to the point where there would just be no way to heat their home. Their right, the end effect is, shut off your heat. Well that doesn't serve anybody when you're breaking pipes and you're freezing -- you know senior citizens are freezing and children. That's what the -- that is a disastrous future in my mind.

REP. WILSON (66TH): Thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST): Thank you, Representative. Representative Dubitsky.
CHRIS HERB: No math questions, please. (Laughing)

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. No, I just wanted -- you indicated that all that was in your written testimony and I'm just wondering under what name did you submit that testimony?

CHRIS HERB: It would have been Christian Herb, Connecticut Energy Marketers -- Marketers Association. I sent that in on Saturday.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): I'm not seeing it here. Okay. If you wouldn't mind checking into it 'cause I don't see your testimony here and I'd like to read it.

CHRIS HERB: I'll make sure that you get a hard copy and we'll resend that on line.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH): Thank you.

CHRIS HERB: Like I said, we talk about the actual impact on families, immediate impacts.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): We're checking on it. Thank you.

CHRIS HERB: I worked so hard on it. I came in on Saturday.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Don't worry. We'll get it up and we will review it and I appreciate you coming out and staying all day with us. Any other questions or comments? No? Thank you. Oh, oh Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): No, I just want to let -- you know let you know that we're not going to let seniors freeze. The example in my town is that we have this whole complex of senior housing and they
all are on the geothermal. They're all very comfortable. Their bills are less because the power demand of that system is much less and they actually have more money to -- they have more money at the end of the month because they live in this type of dwelling. So you know the more clever we get and the more efficient we get they can do better, they can save money but we've got to make that shift over to the new energy efficient clean energy system for many reasons but one of them is just to make these people's lives better.

CHRIS HERB: And you know I've made presentations to your constituents at your invitation a few years back and I would say a geothermal system in some cases is three times the cost of a traditional heating system that can't achieve carbon neutrality with the fuel that is here today. We're not talking -- I'm not over promising and under delivering. I'm telling you; it is here today. There is no requirement for system modifications. We're talking about something that -- the biodiesel portion of heating oil trades under the price of heating oil. It's produced right here in Connecticut. You know, it's just not feasible for at least the two single moms that work for me, to convert to a geothermal system that's three times the cost of -- of a -- of a lower end traditional heating system. That just doesn't -- I don't think that's feasible for most Connecticut residents. Even though I -- even though you're right on the merits of it. It's just not a cost effective option for most Connecticut residents and most of your constituents.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Right. So one of the points of this whole effort is to help people pay for these transitions. Now if you're collecting money from
inefficient fuels and then you're giving it back in efficiency or a new technology or whatever helps the public, then you are getting where you want to go using this pricing system.

CHRIS HERB: I would argue that the way that the Bill is worded, giving 50 percent of the money collected back to them number one, wouldn't generate enough revenue to be able to save for that system that's three times -- we're talking $20,000 for that geothermal system. To save for that and the damage it would do between now and then -- I'm just looking -- like I said, this is in my testimony if received, but if you just look at the impact for home heating oil just in the aggregate, but if you look at it year one .17 cents a gallon more. Year two .40 cents a gallon. By 2028 it's .67 cents a gallon more. They never get there. They move out of state before they can afford your geothermal system that maybe 20, 50 years from now is competitive. It's just not price competitive now and not feasible. The damage that we've done between now and then would be a mess. And the reason why I can say that with all certainty is that I work with people who are in customer's home every day and they will jump for .03 cents a gallon. They'll drive ten miles out of their way for a penny at the pump. I just don't believe that someone is going to say, you know if I can wait long enough to get enough of these rebates I can save up to 15 or 20 grand or 25 grand to do a geothermal system. I just don't see it happening when they'll move from one heating oil dealer who has treated them good for years to another one for a nickel.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay. Well it's really late at night and everybody wants to go home so we can
talk about this later. But just so you're clear where we're trying to go in the really short time period we have to go in. And if you have another way of getting there --

CHRIS HERB: 5380.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): 5380 is not enough savings. It's a nice effort but frankly speaking, it's not enough to save us from climate change.

CHRIS HERB: I wish we passed it three years ago and got a head start on it, but I'm not going anywhere.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Yeah, I know. Well I'll advocate for your Bill.

CHRIS HERB: Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): I'll be happy to do that but it's just a drop in the bucket of what we have to do to get ready for 12 years from now. But thanks, we can talk about this more when you know, when it's a more reasonable hour.

CHRIS HERB: Thank you. I'll hand out with you any day. (Laughing)

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH): Okay, thanks.


CHRIS HERB: Thanks.


JOANNE FLAUM: It's been an interesting day. Thanks. I'm having a problem getting into this one. Is this on? All right. Good. I'm Joanne Flaum.
I'm from Westport. Thank you Madam Chairman, Mr. Chairman, everybody else for letting me speak here.

We all know that global warming is an urgent problem. Economists agree the most effective way to attack the problem is by pricing carbon. I know I'm in the minority here, but that's the way it is. SB 1064 does this. It prices carbon and it will not adversely affect the state's finances. The IPCC Report, the report that was commissioned by the UN tells us that we have 12 years as Representative Mushinsky has said, to combat global warming. That's it. We have to get started. We have -- Connecticut agreed to the Paris Climate Accords. We have laws that say we have to reach a certain amount of reduction in greenhouse gases by 2030, 2050, 2040 but we're not doing anything. We need to actually do something. This Bill comes up, as everyone has pointed out, every year for three years and nothing happens. We have 12 years left. If someone has a better idea, great but I agree that we're not going to do it 15 pieces. We have to do something major.

I know there was a lot of discussion about people being able to afford it. This Bill as Representative Steinberg pointed out when he was here, can be revenue neutral or revenue positive. If it's revenue neutral that means the money goes back to people, gets distributed to everybody at the end of the year. It gets taxed and then it gets distributed back. And in fact, usually poorer people get more back. They get more back than they paid in taxes and as you go up the scale -- it's three minutes already? (Laughing) As you go up the scale people will end up -- you know the higher brackets they'll -- now I lost my whole train of thought with that Bill. At the higher brackets
they'll be paying more than they get back. But it's not like we're -- this money has to come out of these people's pockets and never go back into them. I don't see another alternative to get us where we need to be in 12 years. I think we need to pass this Bill and we need to do it now. We can't just kick it down the road for next year and next year and next year. We have to do something.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH): Thank you so much Ms. Flaum. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee? No? Thank you again for hanging in with us tonight. And are -- I think our last speaker is Denise Savageau on S -- actually HB 6647. Is Denise here? No? Is there anybody else who is present who would like to provide testimony that did not get a chance to speak? All right with that we will conclude the public hearing.