

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-346		208	3	2	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 397 <i>Environment</i> 381 • <i>Environment</i> 403 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3098-3099(<i>Consent</i>) 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1778-1779

H-114

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 7
3011-3376**

Business on the calendar for Wednesday, May 19, 1971 -
Page 1 of the calendar, the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 95th.

REPRESENTATIVE SARASIN:

Prior to moving to the Consent Calendar, I would ask that one item be removed, Page 2, Calendar 1001, Senate Bill 1722, File 1028 and 645. I ask that be removed from the consent calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

So ordered.

REPRESENTATIVE SARASIN:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable reports and passage of the bills on today's consent calendar which are:

Calendar 979, Senate Bill 0118 - An Act Establishing the Time Limit for the Report of the Port Authority Study Commission, File 865.

Calendar 980, Substitute for Senate Bill 0208 - An Act Concerning Hearings by the Water Resources Commission on Permits for New Discharges, File 866.

Calendar 981, Senate Bill 0417 - An Act Concerning Agreements on Consequences of Excusable Delays, File 661.

Calendar 983, Substitute for Senate Bill 1539 - An Act Changing the Name of the State Welfare Department, file 802.

I move the adoption of these items.

MR. SPEAKER:

Wednesday, May 19, 1971

7

ad

Are there further individual objections. Hearing none, in accordance with our rules, the question on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bills. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The bills are passed.

Representative Prete.

REPRESENTATIVE PRETE:

I move the following items be placed on the consent calendar.

Page 8, Calendar 985, House Bill 5222, File 1066 - An Act Exempting Needles and Syringes Sold on Prescription From the Sales Tax.

Calendar 987, Substitute for House Bill 6822, File 1078 - An Act Concerning External Degrees and College Credit by Examination.

Page 9, Calendar 991, Substitute for House Bill 7312, File 1075 - An Act Authorizing the Establishment of Schools Without Walls and the Delegation by School Boards to Community Committees of the Power to Administer Same.

Page 10, Calendar 998, Substitute for House Bill 6384, File 1069 - An Act Concerning Consent for Autopsies.

Calendar 1000, Substitute for House Bill 8566, File 1067 - An Act Concerning the Planning Commission Appeals.

Calendar 1003, Substitute for House Bill 7776, File 1086 - An Act Concerning Appeals From Decisions and Actions of the Real Estate Commission.

S-79

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 4
1457-1920**

May 12, 1971

53

Authority Study Commission.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Mr. President, this bill is giving Port Authority more time to file the report because they need it.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage signify by saying aye. AYE Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 610, File 866, Favorable report joint standing committee on the Environment on S.B. 208 An Act Concerning Hearings by the Water Resources Commission on Permits for New Discharges. The Clerk has an error. That's a substitute for Senate bill 208.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's

May 12, 1971

54.

favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

Currently no person made this charge, may make any discharges or initiate them into any waters of the state without a permit from the State Water Resources Commission. This bill would require that before a permit is given. A public hearing would take place. No sooner than 30 days after the initial application and no later than 60 days. And it would also require due notice of 20 days before the actual public hearing. Sec. 2 actually just permits that judicial to be held after all the other remedies have been exhausted according to Sec. 1 of this act, and other remedies in the statute.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Please turn to page 8, Cal. 622, File 634 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs on H.B. 5110. An Act Concerning Superintendents of Public and Private Mental Health Facilities.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Alfano.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 2
339-691**

1971

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 10, 1971

and I am sure they can explain any detailed questions which you might have.

Sen. Zajac: My name is Sen. Zajac from the 13th, I would like to speak in favor of S.B. 17, AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR NEW DISCHARGES INTO STATE WATERS, and S.B. 208. AN ACT CONCERNING HEARINGS BY THE WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ON PERMITS FOR NEW DISCHARGES. To distinguish between the two bills as they have virtually the same heading, S.B. 17 would clarify the quality of water that would be discharged on new permits into streams. Certainly this goes along with the thinking of the Environmental Council and cleaning up the pollution in the state. On S.B. 208 this bill would require a public hearing on all applications to the Water Resources Commission for permits on new discharge. We feel this would notify all the cities and municipalities downstream when a new permit had been filed with Water Resources to acknowledge the fact that trouble might be forthcoming. If, in fact, through the public hearings as notified to the City Clerks of the townships downstream, and everything was according to hoyle, and the permit was issued, there's be no axe to grind. We think that this is not to take the Water Resources Commission to task, we know they're doing the best job they possibly can; however, we've had some incidents in Meriden where we've had some trouble with fish kills and so forth. I will submit testimony to that in a minute. This bill would require that 30 to 60 days prior to the new issue of a permit, these public hearings would take place. Back in June of this past year, 1970, we had a fish-kill in the Quinnipiac River, which runs through Meriden from Southington, Wallingford, Hamden; this is a copy, Senate Chairman, of our problem, and the fish-kill area that took place. The fish were literally jumping out of the water, the water was boiling with chemicals, and the fish were jumping on the banks of the streams to get out of the water itself. We feel in that investigation of the problem and trying to find out what we could do, we feel that, in looking in the current law, there was a loophole, or it was just a tightening of the law, it would actually help the Water Resources Commission in enforcing and doing their job. We know that they're doing the best that they can. The local conservation officers have been contacted, and they will testify later; they are all in favor of this bill. Mr. Chairman, I ask your favorable recommendation from committee.

Rep. Lavine: Rep. Lavine, 73rd District. I'd just like to make a few brief comments about H.B. 6478. AN ACT CONCERNING WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION POWERS OVER RADIOACTIVE AND THERMAL DISCHARGES. In the area of thermal discharges, we have a conservation and ecological problem which has not peaked yet. We are just beginning to understand what thermal discharges can do to the life balance in bodies of waters. We have an opportunity here to take action which, in fact, will keep a problem from emerging to the peak, which some of the other problems which come before the committee, have. I hope we're going to act on this. I have only one suggestion for the bill, and that is that the problems of radio-active discharge and thermal discharge are not the same problems. You can have thermal discharges where there is no radio-activity or material, and I think perhaps we see the need for two specific

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 10, 1971

RESPECTING CONTROL OF WATER POLLUTION. This too, setting up a commission to coordinate, let's say, and oversee the various water-polluting situations that we have, we do not believe would be a real duplication of effort; we think it might be helpful. I would like to comment very briefly on S.B. 17 and 208: we recognize the public spirited motivation behind those two pieces of legislation, the great concern of the legislators who introduced them. However, we do believe that they would take a tremendous amount of money in terms of hearings required, in terms of, well, we think they would act as a brake on the progress that is now being made. I want to thank you for permitting me to appear before you.

Mr. Judd: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, my name is Peter H. Judd, I'm a resident of Killingworth, I was a member of the Governor's Committee on Environmental Policy, I'm an independent consultant in institutional development and science fairs. I speak here personally. I'd like to speak in support of S.B. 662 and 402; it seems to me the creation of a Council on Environmental Quality is a continuation of the work of the Committee, and institutionalization of it over a time. Its main purpose should be, and its' as outlined, to pull together information, it is not an operating agency, it should not have the responsibility for operations, in my view. The annual report, it would seem to me, would be a very useful focus for all the citizens and the legislators to see what is happening in the state as a whole. The environmental impact statements, which are provided for in the legislation, from each government agency are extremely important. At the federal level, the state of the art as a member of the Council of Environmental Quality, told me a month or so ago is a very primitive one. This is something that's going to have to be developed, but it is extremely important, as Attorney Brenneman said, to get the agency thinking in the broad terms. The same, by the way, should be true of private industry. The philosophy behind the Council is, as I said, information gathering, research, publicity; it is not a substitute for enforcement, it is not a substitute for administration. Therefore, I do not think that you have either the Council or an Environmental Protection Agency, you eventually do have both. I have true reservations. One is akin to Dr. Horsfall's on 3 (d), the role of adjudicating between state agencies; the second is that I would add qualifications for the members of the Council themselves. I think they should be spelled out rather scientifically, and education qualifications should be spelled out a little bit more. Concerning S.B. 637, it's an excellent statement which should be supported. S.B. 661, concerning parklands, S.B. 638 concerned with statewide zoning seem to me also extremely important, and I will support them wholeheartedly. Too many of the problems come from developments which have a regional, not a local impact. Concerning S.B. 633, my own view is that ecological education is too narrow a concept; I would not support that bill. Environmental education is far broader than that, as some person in New York told me - you can't explain to children in the inner city what the Hudson River is all about, when they've never seen it. The same thing is true of the ecology of small streams in relation to children in local areas. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 10, 1971

Sen. Pac: This committee welcomes to this hearing students of the Becket Academy who I understand have gone canoeing down the Connecticut River, and have used their most prized possessions, their canoes, to block entrance to the city dump that was burning rather odorously. We welcome you, we hope to make the Connecticut not only fit for canoeing, but fishing and swimming as well.

Mr. Cragin: Ray Cragin from Farmington, I'm representing the Connecticut chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. I'd like to just state briefly that we are strongly in favor of S.B. 637, H.B. 6091 concerning the adoption of a Connecticut Environmental Policy Act, and also S.B. 402, which establishes a Council on Environmental Quality. Also I would like to make brief comment on H.B. 5698, regarding the establishment of a council of ecological advisors, and also S.B. 638, regarding a commission on the feasibility of preserving environmental values. We are in favor very strongly of all four of these bills.

Mr. Hylwa: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Walter Hylwa, I am president of the Connecticut Wildlife Federation, chairman of the Meriden Conservation Commission, and chairman of the Quinnipiac Study Committee. I am here to ask you people to give a favorable report to these various bills I have before me. The first bill is S.B. 17 introduced by Sen. Gunther, and concerning a permit for discharge into state waters. We would strongly urge that this bill be adopted, because the quality of our water in Connecticut is long over-due. We hear reports that our water will be cleaned up by 1974; I hope that's an actuality, just not a promise. Also we would like to have you give a favorable report on S.B. 208 introduced by Sen. Zajac of Meriden. We feel this bill is very important to those communities that are bordering on the downstream end of some of our rivers and our creeks. We at Meriden have a considerable amount of money invested in the Quinnipiac River under the open-space program, and we plan to develop Hanover Pond, but if we aren't made aware of what's happening up in Cheshire, Southington, and Plainville, and don't have anything to talk about or to go to a public hearing to express our opinion as to what's being discharged into the river, I think it's very unfortunate for us. I think this bill is a very good bill, because it does give the people on the downside part of the stream who are the recipients of everything that comes into the river, it's not the people on the upside part of the stream, as you well know. I always feel sorry for Milford and Stratford, New Haven, and so forth, because they receive everything that comes down the Housatonic River, the Quinnipiac River, the Connecticut River, and it's most unfortunate for these communities. I think they should have a decided say in these matters. I don't think this is going to restrict the Water Resource Commission in any way, I think this will add to their effectiveness, and I think this will improve the so-called quality of our water by 1974. I would also like to have you people give favorable reports on the following bills, I won't speak on these because they've been all covered: S.B. 275, 289, 402, 633, 637, 638, 658, 662 and 664. Thank you very much.