

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-845		1485	13	4	4
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 497 • <i>Environment</i> 586 • <i>Environment</i> 591-607 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5924-2928 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2832-2835

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226**

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

28

report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. DOOLEY (47th):

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us would substantially improve bidding procedures for public works projects on all buildings leased or rented by the state and those financed with state funds. It requires, in additions to bids by general contractors, bids from sub-contractors for certain work including heating, ventilating and air-conditioning in these buildings, plumbing and electrical installations. The sub-contractor bids under this bill must be submitted one week before the bid for the general contract. The low bids would be sent to general contractors and they would include them in their bids to the state. Upon a showing, however, by the low general contractor that the low sub-contractor is unqualified, the next lowest bidding would be awarded the job by the general contractor. Failure of the sub-contractor then to perform would result in a forfeiture of the state bond. This procedure, Mr. Speaker, is known as the pre-file method, is currently used by the State of Connecticut on larger projects. This particular bill would permit this type of procedure on smaller projects and should result in considerable savings to the people of our state. It is a good bill and I would urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1541, substitute for S.B. No. 1485, An Act Concerning Solid Waste Management, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

29

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, I move the Joint Committee's favorable report as amended by the Senate Amendment Schedule "A" and the passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will call Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A" adopted by the Senate on June 3rd.

In line 8, after the word "system" insert a comma and the following words: "but shall not include scrap metals held for reuse or resale by a scrap metal dealer."

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, I think that that particular line is self evident and I move the passage of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on Senate "A"? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? Senate "A" is ADOPTED.

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, we passed a bill which established a Office of Solid Waste Management within the Department of Health. We're now coming to the reason for having taken that action. We, this bill is a landmark bill in solid waste management. What it does is have the Commissioner of Health, and again the explanation of this would be moved into the Department of the Environment, have the Commissioner of Health make a statewide plan to have all of our regions participate in solid waste managements. Now these plans have to be drawn up by 1973 with municipalities having until 1974. This will make us eligible for a substantial amount of funds. There's

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

30

70 million now available; next year, there'll be 80 million and then there will be considerable other funds which will be available. The Commissioner can have monies for setting up demonstration projects in various parts of the state. This bill also provides for planning grants for the various towns within the region to go into a regional plan, 10% for each town for planning up to 70%, or seven towns, without federal funds. Really when you add federal funds on to this, you can come up to as much as 85%. It also provides money for construction up to 25% for a municipality and then for each additional town entering into a solid waste compact, there's an additional 10% up to 65% and if they go into bulky waste production, there's another 5% which is 70%, again without the federal contributions which will bring it up substantially higher. Finally, for those of us who represent a smaller town, there is a provision in here for land fill and also for the equipment which is necessary to have these land fill carried out and that goes up again to the 70% for both the land fill operation and the equipment without the federal participation.

Now, this is an enormously important bread and butter bill to everybody within the State of Connecticut and I certainly move the passage of this bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill as amended?

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, through you, a question for the proponent of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

djh

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

31

Thank you, sir. Through you, Mr. Speaker, a question whether or not any money is provided in the bond program that's been approved by this House for this particular item of legislation?

djh

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. In 1969, \$12 million was provided for this and this money has not yet been expended.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, another question. Is \$12 million sufficient to handle this?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

Mr. Speaker, with the amount of federal funds which will hopefully, which are now available and with the participation which has already taken place in this bill which has not been overwhelming to the time, we do feel that the \$12 million will be sufficient. We do have the \$12 in '69 and we haven't had, considered really massive participation in this program.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another question through you to the proponent of the bill. Is there any money allotted in the budget that's been adopted by this House, current budget, for this piece of legislation?

MR. LAVINE (73rd):

I'm going to have to pass that question to one of the people who were perhaps more proficient in the budget. I can't answer that one.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

I would put this question to anyone who may wish to answer. Is there any money currently in the budget for this piece of legislation?

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

32

THE SPEAKER:

Will you respond? If not, the gentleman from the 95th.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose this bill primarily because there's no money involved, allowed. The best information we have is that there will be current expenses of at least \$1 million and neither budget provides for this expenditure. There will be a bonding fund expense of \$17,200,000 and neither budget provides, neither bonding program provides for this expenditure. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we're creating another situation where we're simply here on this floor today appropriating money that no one has really thought about where it was going to come from and on that basis, I must oppose the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the bill? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed?

The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 1542, substitute for S.B. No. 1609, An Act Concerning State Employment, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", in concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark?

MR. MOTTO (3rd):

Will the Clerk please read Senate Amendment "A"?

djh

**S-81
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 6
2436-2873**

June 3, 1971

Page 105

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, with Senator Caldwell's approval, I don't believe there's any opposition to that. To the best of my knowledge, could go on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any opposition to the passage of this bill? If not, if it will be moved. We'll pass it right now.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

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

THE CHAIR:

Is there any opposition, if not, the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1046. File No. 1541. Favorable report of the joint committee on the Environment. Substitute Senate Bill 1485. An Act Concerning Solid Waste Management.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. The Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk, please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT SCHEDULE, A, offered by Senator Pac:

In line 8, after the word system, insert a comma and the following words: but shall not include scrap metals held for re-use or resale by a scrap metal dealer.

SENATOR PAC.

June 3, 1971

Page 106

Mr. President, this amendment would merely exclude scrap metal or other salvagable materials that are handled by scrap metal dealers from the definition of solid waste. It was not the intention of the committee to include this kind of operation within the scope of this act.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of adoption signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The amendment is adopted. You may proceed on the bill, as amended.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move passage of the bill, as amended. Connecticut is a highly urbanized and highly congested area. In line with our concern with the environment, we have this increasingly great concern for the problem of solid waste disposal. And the problem is what to do with all these mountains of solid waste and refuse that we have. Of course, the problem is how do we dispose them? In landfill sites, even in areas where we do have land, the earthability to cleanse these wastes is over taxed. So, we must look for another means of disposal. Meant that would achieve the maximum reduction of solid waste and this is what this bill does. It would have the Commissioner of Health and in his absence, or if we do pass an Environment Bill, it would be the Commissioner of Environment, he would be required to draw up a solid waste management plan for the State of Connecticut. And, this is a requirement under the new Federal Act of 1970. In order to gain any funds, we must pass an act of this type.

We would be required to draw up a solid waste management plan for all the ten solid regional planning areas in the State. It could work together with these regional planning areas. And come up with some sort of a reason

June 3, 1971

Page 107

able solution. In line with this, these plans would have to be drawn up by July 1, 1973. They would have to be adopted by the municipalities by 1974.

The Commissioner would be allowed to make plans up to 70%, which is an increase over the 50% allowed in 1969 session. There are 12 million dollars still available from the 1969 Clean Air Act and these funds could be used to construction of facilities for the reduction of solid waste, for buildings and other equipment land fill sites.

It would also provide for funds for implementation of these plans of 10% of the non-federal portion for each municipality and another 10% for each municipality that comes in with them.

So this is about the extent of this act. I think it's a great step in the right direction of getting rid of all these mountains of refuse.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR CASHMAN:

Mr. President, not to delay the proceedings, but, this is, in my judgment one of the most important bills we've had before us in this session. I'd like to commend Senator Pac and his committee, which I had the pleasure of serving on for doing such a fine job. This is an excellent and very worthwhile bill.

SENATOR RUDOLF:"

Mr. President, just briefly, I;d like to endorse the remarks of Senator Pac. This is a most important piece of legislation, simply because most of our cities are facing a crisis, in the State of Connecticut, today, in attempting to resolve the waste problem. And I support the bill.

SENATOR CASHMAN:

June 3, 1971

Page 108

For the benefit of the Senator from the, my name is Cashman.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor signify by saying, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it; the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 1066. File No. 1522. Favorable report of the joint committee on Appropriations. Substitute Senate Bill 55. An Act Concerning the Appointment of Bailiffs in the Circuit Court.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. There is no money required in this appropriation measure. The money is in the Judicial Department. It's a great bill. It provides for the appointment of bailiffs and employees of the Circuit Court. I believe the Senator from the Third earlier in discussing the tremendous re-organization that the Courts are undergoing, in the State of Connecticut certainly can use this bill to supplement his court reform bill.

Each bailiff will be appointed and shall in addition in addition to attending court serve subpoenas for the Prosecuting Attorneys and public defenders of the Circuit Court. He shall perform any other such duty as shall be assigned him by the Clerk of the Presiding Judge of the Court. And I think I've spoken longer than I should. I leave it to the circle.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage signify by saying, "aye"/ Opposed, "nay". The nays have it. The bill is defeated.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 2
339-691**

1971

WEDNESDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 17, 1971

community , might be a better way of, or more desirable way of providing grants to the municipalities for this purpose. The only other point I'd like to bring out is, it mentions here that the Commissioner of Health shall designate solid waste regions. There is a bill S.B.-1485 which I believe Sen. Pac has submitted which we feel would take care of all of the intensive purposes of this bill in allowing grants and it also does call for a plan for solid waste management to be prepared by communities. In the preparation of such a plan the formation of recommendations for formations of a regional district would automatically be taken care of by this type of a bill. We dont feel there's need for designating a state official at this point to try and designate these regions. The preparations of clauses which is most important, and if so doing, this will automatically be taken care of. Any questions?

Edward W. Hutchison: Sharon. This statement is made on behalf of the Connecticut Audubon Council, which is made up of eleven organizations interested in conservation with a total state-wide membership of over nine thousand. We are concerned with the Act to establish Environmental Standards for Public Utilities, S.B.1458. In the past the production of electric power has resulted in vast construction, sited simply wherever engineers and businessmen considered most convenient and economically advantageous to themselves. Their heedlessness of environmental factors resulted in many monstrosities and public eyesores, as well as much needless destruction of wildlife and ecological values. This is still largely true today in spite of some improvement in attitude. Also they still continue to be guilty of massive pollution, both atmospheric and thermal. As the need for electric power increases and more power plants have been built, obviously such disregard for the environment has become utterly intolerable on account of only too pressing reasons of health, aesthetics and ecology. Such a reckless lack of policy in regard to power plant siting results in waste of vital resources which we can no longer afford or tolerate. Therefore, the Connecticut Audubon Council fully endorses the purposes and proposed methods presented in S.B.1458 and we earnestly urge its adoption into the law of this state.

Mrs. John Jinishian: I'm here to represent the Greenwich Environmental Action Group. We have come today to express our approval for S.B.1458 after having looked at several of the other bills and studied them. To start, we particularly applaud the statements of findings and purposes to be found on pages 1 and 20 of the bill, because of their emphasis on three areas of major importance, namely long-range planning, setting environmental standards, and encouraging research. As controversies between utility companies and citizens multiply in our state, we believe that it is urgent that Connecticut set up an unbiased Council to develop a rational energy policy which would establish priorities for power uses, a policy which would arrive at a balance between real power needs and the need to protect the environment. Our present system makes no attempt to use foresight and provides no single State agency with the authority to analyse a proposal in all its facets. Furthermore, because increasing use of electrical power has been equated, in the past, with economic growth, and because projected power needs

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

I'm from the city of Winsted, and I'm speaking in favor of S.B. 1485. Mr. Chairman, we in the district are very interested in this bill, particularly the towns of Barkhamsted, Colebrook, New Hartford, and Winchester. We are the first regional land fill district within the state. We are presently serving a site within a township of Barkhamsted for a solid waste disposal area, and as I look over the proposed bill of Sen. Pac, I feel that this would be a great help to the districts; particularly these towns because the state as you know, set up the rules and regulations on what and how it should be done, and I feel that it's only fair that the state should pay it's share. Mr. Chairman, we want to go on record as being very much in favor of this proposed legislation and I'm also speaking for the other members of the Commission. We urge a favorable report sir.

Rep. O'Neill, 52nd District: Good morning Mr. Chairman. I'm here this morning on behalf of the towns of E. Hampton, and the other towns that I represent on S.B. 1485. I think that Rep. Groppo has gone into the details of the bill, and I do think it's absolute necessity that legislation like this becomes enacted, because we are demanding of small towns on refuse etc. that they be cleaned up by the state law, and yet at the same time we are not funding them in any way to do so. I think Mr. Chairman, that this bill would help a great deal to your small towns as well as your municipalities. Thank you very much.

Charles Kurker: Chief of Solid Waste Section of the State Department of Health. I'd like to speak on two bills, S.B. 1281 and also S.B. 1485. S.B. 1281 is, AN ACT PROVIDING STATE GRANTS-IN-AID FOR MUNICIPAL RECYCLING PLANTS. I have reviewed this bill which would provide state aid to a municipality or group of municipalities which unite in the collection, sorting and distributing of waste materials for recycling. I favor the intent of this bill, However, I realize the fiscal problems that presently prevail in the state. When the fiscal picture improves, I feel there is need for providing the types of grants-in-aid provided for in this bill. In reviewing this bill, I would like to recommend the following modifications to this bill because of problems that have accounted with the present grant bill program that was passed by the 69 General Assembly. (1) Specify what costs the grants in this bill shall include. I suggest the costs for planning, design and construction of the buildings and equipment needed for the program be eligible for a grant. I think at this time it's fiddicult to estimate what kind of cost of operation may be needed so that cost of operation would not recommend my being quoted here. (2) The word "district" be replaced by the word "region" and region be defined as in Substitute Bill No. 1485 which would allow municipalities form a district, sign an interlocal agreement or sign a mutual contract for a definite period of time. But it would not bind them to the requirement of forming a district as defined in the status presently. This has been a drawback in some programs. (3) The words "the nonfederal portion of" should be added after the stated percentages of the cost of the programs. This would reduce the state's share in the event that the programs were eligible for a federal grant. (4) Condition 5 in line 35 on Page 1 of 2 refers to "Commission!" This should be changed to "commissioner." I assume here

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

the one you represent are destroying it. So I think what the legislature is simply doing is reacting to a fact of life.

Judge Steiber: I think your right, and that's what is should do. It's primarily just a question of priority and I'm not sufficient authority to know whether 15,000 acres of wetland is more than enough or not enough; I cant go into that.

Rep. Ciampi: There won't be any cross-discussions, please state your purpose, and the Senator or Representative will question.

E. Pagano: The Senator asked a question. Are we currently filling in the land? And this has been in process for several years. Yes we are.

Rep. Fox, 152nd District: You indicate your feeling that the state has an obligation to compensate for the restriction on wetland properties. Will you tell me why you feel that way, and how do you distinguish between the similar type of restrictions on wetland properties? Tell me why you feel that way, how do you distinguish between the similar types of restriction on residential and business land where the right of owner can really exercise his use of the land is restricted by the state; how do you distinguish?

Judge Steiber: Zoning restrictions? Well, normally zoning is considered appropriate when land is zoned for the highest, and best use to be made of the land by the zoning regulations. That's usually the theory of zoning. What we're saying is you own the land but because the state has an interest in the preservation of wetlands, you make no use of it whatsoever. There's a difference between saying what use you can make of it, and saying you may make no use of it. With the wetlands if the Commissioner refuses your permit to use the land the way the bill reads now, it means you may make no use whatsoever, and your certainly entitled to compensation and it's my belief that a court test will show that when you have to go to the Commissioner and get his permission to use the land in any way whatsoever, this in effect is taking your land, and it entitles you to compensation. That's what I say; this amendment H.B.8302 will make the law livable, and let everybody know what their rights are, will not obligate the state to payment as soon as the wetlands are established.

Rep. Tiffany, 70th District: How many acres are involved with your client's?

Judge Steiber: About 50 acres.

Rep. Ciampi: So we'll have some continuity, we're going to speak on S.B.1485. First of all, are there any other representatives that want to speak before we go again with the public portion?

Rep. Hanzalek: 40th District. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I spoke to you a few weeks ago about H.B.8268 which makes some technical changes in section 19507B and 19508A. S.B.1485 tries to solve the problem by writing an entirely new statue. The dif-

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

ferences involved I won't go into, but the reason for my coming today was that because of the inconsistencies in the present section 19507B. Some 30 towns in the State of Connecticut have not gotten a grant for their sanitary land-fill operations, or equipment for such which they expected to get and had every right to believe that they could. One of the selectmen of one of those thirty towns wanted to testify last time, but was unable to make a statement, and because of that, I thought I would come in and try to give you this kind of information. I'll also give you a copy of the letter he sent to me that as far as he was concerned H.B.8268 which made changes in the clean-air legislation, was preferable as far as he was concerned over S.B.1485. Secondly; a copy of a letter that he received from the Commissioner of Health, which points out some of the problems that are involved.. In the existing statute you see the commission was give the authority to approve all the monetary request, but the Commissioner was given the funds to disburse, therefore in this particular case as well as in the case of 30 other towns, the paper work has been approved down to the last comma. But no money has been forthcoming, and I'm sure that you'll solve that this year. Thank you.

Rep. R. Argazzi, 25th District: I want to thank the Chairman for letting us out in like this; I had to testify at another hearing previously. I'm here to testify in favor of S.B.837, which is a bill to regulate noise pollution more specifically as it relates to the supersonic transport planes. This is a similar bill which is pending in New York, and California now. Even tho recent events have sort of taken away the critical nature of this bill, I think it's still relevant because; (1) there will be presumably foreign SST planes landing or seeking to land in Connecticut or Connecticut areas; (2) there's still no insurance that the SST is dead as a practical matter in this country. Really, all the bill does, it's not that revolutionary a bill, and I'm glad it didn't get the publicity that it did in other states where people even came from abroad to testify against it. All it does really is try to hold the people who are connected with the SST to the noise levels that they claim reaches. They claim that the SST super-sonic transports produce a noise level when they land, which is equal to, or lower than the present sub-sonic planes. I've been in communication with Representative Stein in New York who introduced the bill there, and I've had access to all the information and experts that he's had, and they indicate that the super-sonic transport when it lands is 40 times as loud as sub-sonic transports it reaches the noise level of 124 per-centage noise in decibels. If their claiming that super-sonic transports only reaches 108 decibels then let's hold them to it. The way I've gone about doing this is to amend our air pollution control law, section 19505 to say that noise at a level greater than 108 per-centage noise in decibels is evidence of air pollution. As you know, air pollution is harmful, and there are many types of air pollution and it's recognized now by pollution experts that if you have too many decibels in the air, you have a form of air pollution that could disturb hearing, nervous system, and everything else, and there are all kinds of studies on this. So, #1 section just states a purpose, namely to hold the super-sonic transport to this level

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

when it lands. Section 2 would amend the air pollution law to provide that a noise greater than 108 per-centage in decibals is evidence of air pollution. Section 3 would establish a class action right or remedy, giving a person the right to enjoy the landing of super-sonic transports that obtain a greater noise or in the alternative to seek damages for harm to health or property or well-being. As I say, it's a simple bill, and if the Committee desires any more information or data there is voluminous data available which I could get for you very easily, and I would ask that you give it your serious support because I know there will be super-sonic transports trying to land in this state, and if they are going to create a health hazard and reach a noise which is extremely unsafe, I think we should do something about it. Thank you very much.

Attorney George Levine: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm an attorney in Hartford, and I'm here representing the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel. We have no objection to S.B.1485 except in one regard. The statement of purpose in the bill indicates that the intent is to control solid waste disposal, and to preserve as much as possible of the available land that's available for disposal of refuse. We're concerned because some of the definitions in Section 1 of the bill could be construed to include scrap metal operations. We don't feel that scrap metal in any way is a waste product; it really is a raw material. In no way are we disposing of these scrap metals when scrap metal dealers are handling them, rather, their holding them only for reuse or resale. We really don't think that the Commissioner of Health would like to have jurisdiction of scrap metal dealers and the way they conduct their businesses, although as I say it would be possible under this bill as it's now drafted for him to be required to assume that control. We'd like to suggest to you an amendment to sub-sections C of section 1, which would very clearly clarify the question of whether or not scrap metal dealers would be in the purview of this bill, it would merely add to sub-section C of the language, but refuse should not include scrap metal held for reuse or resale. I have a statement on that Mr. Chairman; could I submit that please? I also am here in regard to another bill if I could at this time. I'd like to merely make known our position on that bill. It's H.B.5451 which would authorize the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to create junk yards for abandoned automobiles. We're opposed to this bill, we see no need for it; again we don't think the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles has any particular expertise in the junk business. There are adequate facilities now, we agree that the cost of disposing of vehicles is high, but it certainly would not be reduced if the Commissioner without expertise would get into this business in competition with the existing operators. Thank you.

Arthur J. Mulligan: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm Director of Public Works, town of East Hartford. We're here to represent the Town of E. Hartford in favor of H.B.1485. We fully concur with the bill. We hope section 13 could be a little more generous in it's allocation of funds for operational expenses and purposes. We'd like to

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

see a minimum of a dollar per capita in that area. All the towns are having problems in this particular area of refuse, but we feel it's the larger cities and towns that are really up against it; we feel that this area could definitely benefit us all. Thank you.

Elliot S. Rose: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I'm with Connecticut Paper Company of Waterbury, and I'm here to speak in favor of a substitute bill, H.B.1485. First of all we're very pleased to find in there, there's some encouragement for participation by private industry in the solid waste disposal problem. We've had a pile operation going in Waterbury for several months, and we come to some fairly good conclusions on this. First of all, in looking this bill over, we feel that if it's carried out to it's full intent and purpose, it can eliminate at least 60% of all the solid waste which is now generally in the state, and causing so much of a problem. Secondly, it can substantially cut down air pollution since most of this waste can be handled without any incineration. This is a very important factor. Thirdly, it will probably substantially cut down on the need for land fill programs. So we want to give this bill our support.

Rep. Avcollie: 94th District. I'd like to speak on H.B.8238, which is cosponsored by Rep Sarasin, and myself. It addresses itself to the completion of the development of High Rock State Park. High Rock Park is located in Beason Falls and Naugatuck, and partially in the town of Oxford. During the last 4 years the state has allocated \$75,000 for the development of this park. A forest ranger station has been located at the top of High Rock and is ready for occupancy in about 1 month. There have been fresh water wells already sunk into the ground. The Park has been improved a great deal during the last four years, and the Parks and Forests have already paid for a completed plan which calls for the development of the park over a five year period. This bill seeks \$250,000 in authorized bonding as the Parks and Forest Commission would direct over the five year period, so that at the end of 5 years the Park would be completely developed and used. I think this is one of the largest acreage wise in the State of Connecticut. It has hitherto been rather undeveloped and left at the hands of the vandals, etc. The construction of the Forest Ranger station would help provide security for this park and for this reason we like now to expand it and make use of all the acreage for camp site, for fishing, boating etc. I believe the Park and Forest Commission would support this bill and I ask that you look into it closely, and please visit High Rock Park if you haven't seen it. Only I urge that you support this measure so that we can not only expand and finish the program, but to insure the \$75,000 we've already spent at High Rock Park so that it would not be wasted. Thank you.

Joseph Schivone: I'm in the scrap iron and steel business; New Haven Scrap Processing. I thought I would like to speak on H.B.1485. Our attorney who is here and I had not expected him to be here, has anticipated to some extent some of the things that I have to say, and I think perhaps has answered the question. The thing we've been fearful of is that we the collector, whom we think have done a reasonably good job under the

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

circumstances might be impeded in the future if restrictions in the bill necessitated control by the Commissioner. If the proposed amendment suggested by our attorney permits us to be excluded from the operation of that bill. I think then the objective can be accomplished. We don't want and don't feel that any ecological program can be helped if we are further impeded legislatively in our endeavor to try to do the job that the scrap processor is ordained for. He has done and has been the original, I think, ecologist. From away way back he sought to recycle materials, and I think you Committee is well aware of the fact that anything that would impede his efforts would impede the bill and that is my only concern, that he not be impeded, and I think that's the concern of most of the scrap metal processors. Thank you.

F.W. Workman: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I'm working at Air pollution and Solid Waste Section serving as liaison, but spend most of my time in the matter of recycling. I guess this is going to shock you in some ways. I would prefer to render a statement rather than to take up your time at this moment other than to make this observation. Speaking in favor of bills S.B.1485 and S.B.1285 it is so paramount that waste resource recovery and recycling become a part of the overall solid waste matter management program, and from this end when I hear someone like Mr. Schivone referred to himself as a scrap dealer, he is the paramount recycler certainly in the field, and you should know that this is the man who built the car fragment here in North Haven. He is a neighbor of mine, and a very distinguished citizen of Connecticut. These are the people that are going to resolve our problems in recycling, in other words, the industry. These are the people I have been working with. One or two observations should be made, certainly the statement that Mr. Levine for the scrap iron dealers would have the departments concurrence in full. I think another point that should be made is the planning grants to municipalities would be matched dollar per dollar under the waste resource recovery act of 1970. Rather than to take up more time let me make one more observation. Certainly the problem of solid waste must be looked upon with equal emphasis along with air pollution. We begin to look upon waste as the parent of pollution. Maybe we will become realistic, it would be my hope as a citizen that we not build up an air pollution bureaucracy at the expense of dealing with the basic problems. So I will defer and submit a statement with regard to somewhat of a summary of these matters, and leave time for what I hope will be some presentations of the industry who are really going to help us solve this problem. Thank you.

Walter McKinney: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee on the Environment. I'm a Vice-President of the Emhart Corporation. Our Hartford division is a major producer of machinery for the glass industry. We would like to go on record as supporting the general concepts, and philosophy of S.B.1485 as submitted by Sen. Pac. We believe this type of bill represents a proper approach to the problems of solid waste. We, however, do not believe that the legislation you are also considering to ban or tax the non-returnable container will obtain the objectives we all want,

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

to improve the environment and reduce the litter. We previously addressed ourselves to these bills in a letter dated March 8th to all members of the Committee, and we would like your permission at this time to put a copy of this letter into the records of the Committee. We support the principles of S.B.1485. In line with this letter it should be pointed out that as we understand it, the Federal Resources Recovery Act of 1970 authorizes the expenditure on a nationwide basis for more than 460 million dollars over the next 3 years on a solid waste and resource recovery program, which could revolutionize present disposal methods. This act could provide up to 75% federal assistance to develop and construct advanced resource recovery systems. The State of Connecticut has an excellent opportunity to lead the nation by example in the expert management of solid waste by the implementation of legislation such as S.B.1485. Thank you.

Att. Robert Hartigan: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm a Hartford attorney, and I am appearing before you on behalf of the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute. The Institute which I represent favors the bill or the principles behind S.B.1485. I think many of you will recall the testimony that we've presented, and which was presented by the soft drink bottling industry and others in this state on measures before you which would ban the non-returnable bottle. We feel that this type of bill, S.B.1485, which represents a frontal assault on what is essentially a broad problem is a much better way of attack. This litter waste disposal problem, and therefore urge your favorable consideration of it. Thank you.

Rep. Hogan: Mr. Hartigan, it's very nice to have you appear in favor of one of our bills.

Mr. Hartigan: I'd like to add it's very nice for me too.

Melvin Schreidermeyer: I am the Director of Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency, and I'm here representing that agency as well jointly representing the Central Connecticut Refuse Commission. Both agencies strongly support and endorse Substitute Bill 1485. The Regional Planning Agency has prepared a plan for refuse disposal working on this since 1968, and we now have about a year experience with our refuse commission. This commission was established under the inter-local agreement statutes, and it is aimed at the implementation of that plan so that these two agencies have involved in the two major steps in achieving some kind of solution, the planning and the actual development. We feel that this bill is a great improvement and worthy of implementation. Some of the definitions, however, I think could be clarified. The word region is defined in section 1, region, I think to most people has the connotation of a geographic area. I realize that it is defined in a way it would be changed. I would suggest that rather than the word region, that we substitute the phrase, regional refuse disposal board, to clarify that point,--I would suggest, and later I'm going to suggest that regional planning agencies have an involvement here so I would add

FRIDAY
10:00A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

the definition of a regional planning agency, that agency being established under section A-31A. There is a distinction between these management plans. I'm delighted to see the definition of a solid waste management plan because we have one of those. But I think there's an additional plan, and that's a solid waste implementation plan. I would suggest the inclusion of this definition of a solid waste implementation plan meaning, a detailed planning proposal engineering specifications administrative practices, proposals operating plans, and, or financial programs aimed at the total or partial effectuation of the management plan. So often we do not take a major step and achieve a refuse disposal system in one step. We're implementing portions of the management plan. I would carry these comments throughout the bill, and I won't make the points on where each of these apply, but I would carry through the difference between the implementation proposals and the management plan. I would also suggest that in section 10, regional planning agencies, as there are 13 constituted in the State of Connecticut at this time, be a possible recipient of planning funds to the refuse disposal planning. Many have already done this planning, but others haven't, and we find in our areas most local government officials prefer not to keep creating additional bodies to work on problems, they would rather use established institutions, such as regional planning agencies could be an established institution to study a management plan, prepare a management plan, and possibly prepare an implementation plan. So I would include regional planning agencies in Section 10. One final comment---our experience in the Central Connecticut Refuse Commission. We started out with four municipalities, Plainville, Berlin, New Britain, and Middletown, trying to prepare an inter-local agreement aimed at refuse disposal. It's extremely difficult, as I'm sure you will aware, to put together two towns, to get them to move forward in agreement. I would favor modifying the financial aid formula to give additional incentive to the incorporation of a second town on a refuse disposal system. Most of the systems we have looked at are expandable, once they are established, and once two towns get together and provide the basic volume of refuse necessary to make it economical to run some kind of bulk reduction facility, then other towns can join. We find that it's very difficult talking in the abstract without an existing refuse reduction system to get 3,4,5, or 6 towns together all at once. We support the incremental kind of funding. Your talking here about whereas each town comes in up to a maximum of at least 70%, there would be additional funds. This is a good idea, and my point is, I would like to see some additional incentive just to get that second municipality involved. Under the previous program there was 25% for one municipality, and 50% for two. That additional 25% was not sufficient incentive to get the City of Bristol to bring in one more community. Bristol has a budding community that are very small, Berlington is about 3500, and Plymouth around 11,000 people. So we see in our area that it's critical to get at least 2 towns working together to get a system running. After this is established, I'm sure other towns will join with it. I'm sure we'll realize the economies and these are my comments. I would submit them in a letter later. Thank you.

Charles Whittay: I'm Assistant City Manager of Norwich, Connecticut. I'm

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

here this morning in behalf of the Norwich City Council, and the City Manager Thomas H. Hesson, to speak in favor of S.B.1485. Although I don't have a formal statement I will submit one at a later date. The City of Norwich is faced with a critical refuse disposal problem at this time. We have, in fact, been ordered by the State of Connecticut to discontinue our present operation and to find an alternate method by the first of June. Therefore, we are seeking an alternative. We desperately need support of the State of Connecticut in this regard. We are faced as a community with capital outlays of roughly 20 million dollars in addition to our normal budget for new school and sewers. Therefore, we need your help in order to establish a new operation within Norwich. We need assistance not only in the initial purchase but also as far as equipment is concerned. We are considering a regional approach. Nothing definite has been decided yet, but the funding of this would be critical. Therefore, I urge that you give careful consideration to this bill, and to come back with a favorable report. Thank you very much.

Leonard O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Committee. I am the Supervisor of Environmental Health for the town of Fairfield. Approximately a year and a half ago discussions started with the towns of Bridgeport, Stratford, Trumbull, Westport, and Monroe, to get a study on the solid waste implementation plan. This study became a reality last Wednesday when the contract was signed. WE're under the impression under the 1969 Act that some money would be forthcoming for planning. But pursuing the matter further we didn't receive any funds for planning. We would like to recommend that the effective date of this act pertaining to planning only be effective January 1, 1971. Thank you very much.

Jack McCarthy: I'm District Director of Air Pollution Control for the City of Bridgeport. I strongly second Mr. O'Neil's motion as to January 1 as the effective date. I also would like to bring reference to section 6 sub-section C of this substitute bill. Commenting on such individual plans shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner. I feel there is enough red tape going on right now. We have a region, we have to go through the Federal Government, the municipalities, and to the State and back again to have another stop-gap like the regional planning,-- I feel it's duplicity of effort. I strongly feel that they should have a right to review and comment, but approval I think is creating another monster. I therefore recommend it should be up to the Commissioner himself, and he should have the ability to make his decision so he can have the comment as to review as much as to report That is my statement. Thank you very much.

Bruce Chimento: I'm Senior Civil Engineer Environmental Control, City of Norwalk. I'd like to speak in favor of S.B.1485, especially in the section referring to the regional planning. We need more help in Hartford to set up a regional control, and regional planning for solid waste facilities. I think this is where all our needs, the municipalities cannot handle their problems by themselves. Through our regional plan-

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

ning and through our state government, the only way that we can control solid waste management in this state. Thank you.

John Case: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm administrative assistant for the town of Simsbury. I'm speaking in favor of S.B. 11485. My community has 30 some odd communities in this state, has in the past few months taken a sincere effort to comply with the desires of the State Department of Health in improving our land-fill operation by the purchase of the equipment, construction of a building to protect that particular equipment, the additional personnel, and management necessary to put the land-fill operation in a condition that will be satisfactory and meet the demands of the State of Connecticut. We have accomplished this, and at the moment are finishing up the construction of our building, and had hoped to put an application in for a funding as we anticipated. Because of the ruling of the Attorney General, it would appear at the moment we would not be in a position to receive this funding at the other communities are also in the same position. We feel that the state should make every effort to reimburse those towns, and cities that have made every effort, in fact, to comply and put the situation of pollution, streams, air, or otherwise in proper prospective. I therefore ask for support of this bill. Thank you.

Bob Gross: I'm from Hartford, Connecticut; E. Gross & Company. We've been involved with certain parts of solid waste, planning, and program and implementation for the last several years. I think a few facts should be called to the attention of the Committee. One person that did testify here earlier mentioned that approximately 60% of all the solid waste program or the solid waste problem is paper. This gentlemen, has been substantiated in all testimony introduced before Sen. Muskie, the Committee on Solid Waste & Air Pollution in Washington. But there are some interesting facts I think you should be aware of. What constitutes this whole problem? Here in the capital region, just the Hartford Times and the Hartford Courant weekly in excess of 1 million pounds are thrown into the incinerators, or land-fill facilities. Approximately 2 millions of pounds of corrugated go into the land-fill, and incinerators. Approximately 150 thousand pounds of mixed paper in the city of Hartford go into the incinerator, and the adjacent towns that take in land-fill. More recently it came to our attention that with the new telephone books coming in, approximately one million pounds of those towns served out of the Hartford directory are going into the land-fill and incinerator. These are astounding figures but they're true. I think this bill has a lot of strength, but I think it also has a bit of weakness. In it, allows more planning and research, as far as I can personally determine this problem has been researched to death. It's been planned to death. The answer are available, the question is are we going to implement these or are we not? We have here in the capitol region a report from James Migeons, we have the Farmington Watershed, we have all these different reports that have been funded by the State of Connecticut, or H.U.D., or someother federal or state agency. We

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FRIDAY March 26, 1971

have these answers, and yet we have not seen realistically an implementation of one of them. Now, you have put in this proposal bill, I'm looking at Page 3, Section 6, a solid waste planning region of the state by July 1, 1973, in other words the Commissioner shall prepare a solid waste management. Gentlemen; I think all the information is now available, and that should be moved down to December 1, 1971 if your looking for action. Later on we're in the same paragraph, all said plans should be approved by the Department not later than July 1, 1974. I recommend that it be moved down to 1972. All we're doing or what I'm suggesting is to move this time schedule forward so you'll have implementation of some of your thoughts. At the bottom of the same page, the agency municipality of regions shall then be required to correct such deficiencies and adopt their plans. I think something should be put in there within 90-120 or 150 days, because we don't need that much time to figure out the answers,--no one should need that much time. On page 4, Section 8, the Commissioner charge, I think a time limit should be specified. I would like to put in a closing remark--make mention of the fact before Sen. Muskie's Committee, a Dr. Frank Smith, an environmental man here in Hartford, Connecticut did testify that there is solutions to the solid waste problem and he makes mention, I'll read this paragraph, internal recycling and by-products production in a firm's own waste disposal facility, or activity. Either through direct restrictions, on waste disposal, or through the imposition of fees or charges for waste disposal. The waste producing enterprise would presumably be stimulated to seek out alternative uses for this material, and especially uses which might return a revenue to cover these additional costs involved. Alternately, special subsidies for tax relief might be given to encourage firms to introduce or expand processes relating to recycling for by-products, by product production. Finally, one other point that I think is important. In order to basically urge the different towns in the regions as they are set up in the state, that some of the rules and regulations spell out very specifically that towns in excess of a population of 5,000 must be part of some program in order to be a recipient of any state funds. With this being a recipient, some reduction must be made on their part for reducing the amount of volume going into the incinerator or land-fill. This is the key of the solid waste problem, not to how much we can spend for larger facilities, but how much we can reduce that which is going into alternate or resource recovery processes. Thank you.

Sen.

Sen. Cashman: Mr. Gross; what does the Gross Company do?

R. Gross: We're in the scrap business.

William Watson: I'm Health Administrator for the town of Stratford. I'd like to go on record as being in favor of S.B. 1485 with the proposed amendments made by our sister towns Brigepoort and Fairfield. Thank you.

Elliot Rose: Could I add something? I was here before, but first of all I'd like to concur with what Mr. Gross said. I'd also like to make a

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 26, 1971

a suggestion. I think one of the problems with waste disposal is disposing of the product after we've processed it. I would like to suggest that perhaps there should be an implementation to this bill whereby the State at least, such as the Federal Government has started to do now, would be required a certain amount of recycled paper be used at least by the state agencies. This is one of the things which would greatly encourage the use of an implementation program. The Federal Government is doing it now, and I think it's very important for the state to start getting involved in encouraging something of this sort.

Rep. Ciampi: Any else wish to comment on S.B.1485?

Frank Healy: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I'm an attorney from Waterbury, speaking on behalf of Connecticut Motor Stage Association, which is an association of local Motor Bus Companies in Connecticut. I'm here to speak in opposition to H.B.8372 CONCERNING THE USE OF DIESEL FUEL. One of the best resources the State of Connecticut has available to it in this pollution fight, I believe, is the local transit bus, if the public so desires, be greatly used to replace the private passenger car in your downtown transit. It certainly would eliminate about 30 private cars for each bus. The bill before you would prohibit after January 1, 1974 the use of diesel fuel in this state in any motor vehicle. Almost every one of your motor buses, local transit motor buses in this state is a diesel fuel bus. The carriers, the operators of those buses financially are in no position either to invest the capital to replace those buses with non-diesel fuel types or to carry the expense of running such a vehicle after it was replaced, the least expensive fuel we have is diesel fuel. All of the bus operators have converted to this over the period of the past 20 years, so that they could stay in business. I think you ought to use the resource you have, your local bus to fight pollution. I don't think you ought to force them off the street. Thank you very much.

Rep. Matthews: Are the bus companies endaring to use natural gas in motors in any way, are they experimenting in any way. I understand in Hartford there is some effort to be helpful in this way. Although, I think we have had testimony earlier that diesel fuel was less polluting than gasoline. Have you any efforts on the direction of natural gas?

Att. Healy: The actual effort except through federal grant has to come from General Motors and their manufacturers; not through you local operators. They do not have the funds to carry out such a project. I think what your mentioning is a project Connecticut Company is carrying out with federal fundinh. So we don't have the results of that.

Rep. Ciampi: I think we'll go to S.B.818.

Henry Marchese: Speaking in favor of S.B.818. I am the President of the Connecticut Campers Association. I'm representing over 500 families, mainly from Connecticut; some from surrounding states. The Connecticut Campers is the only organization I believe, that's sponser activities in the State Parks that we are camping which is HaHammonasset State Park, Rocky Neck State Park. We sponser activities such as monies and